

committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3186. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Clara B. Mead, of Pomona, Calif., and 17 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3187. Also, petition, of Maude E. Remington, of Pomona, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3188. Also, petition of Martha Davis, of Pomona, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3189. Also, petition of Jennie B. Wilferth, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3190. Also, petition of Helen W. Macfarland, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3191. Also, petition of Shick MacDonald, of Alhambra, Calif., and nine others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3192. Also, petition of Mary J. Hill, of Monrovia, Calif., and 34 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3193. Also, petition of Birdie J. Wright, of Alhambra, Calif., and 19 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3194. Also, petition of Pearl M. Boileau, of Pomona, Calif., and 20 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3195. Also, petition of Olive S. Persons, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3196. Also, petition of Hattie M. Cannon, of Pomona, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3197. Also, petition of Harry G. Earle, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3198. Also, petition of M. E. Bridgeford, of Pomona, Calif., and seven others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3199. Also, petition of Clara M. Lee, of Pomona, Calif., and four others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3200. Also, petition of E. B. Brand, of Ontario, Calif., and six others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3201. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Strehlon, of Hollywood, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3202. Also, petition of C. C. Nevins, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3203. Also, petition of G. W. Mack, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3204. Also, petition of Irene V. Arnold, of Monterey Park, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3205. Also, petition of Mrs. James Wheatley, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3206. Also, petition of Mrs. Guy Schubarth, of Pomona, Calif., and nine others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3207. Also, petition of Mrs. Guy P. Duffield, Jr., of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others,

urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3208. Also, petition of Lila Lusher, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3209. Also, petition of Alice S. Spencer, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3210. Also, petition of Mrs. Frankie Mae Patch, of Arcadia, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3211. Also, petition of Mrs. L. S. MacDougall, of Arcadia, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3212. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Russell, of Arcadia, Calif., and 18 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3213. Also, petition of Rev. E. B. Hager, of Monrovia, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3214. Also, petition of Moses Breeze, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3215. Also, petition of Wilma Freeman, of Arcadia, Calif., and 16 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3216. Also, petition of Mrs. J. C. Baldwin, of Arcadia, Calif., and 23 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3217. Also, petition of Martha Riford, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3218. Also, petition of Birdie J. Wright, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3219. Also, petition of Evla M. Walker, of Monterey Park, Calif., and five others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3220. Also, petition of Peter Beck, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3221. Also, petition of John M. Kephart, of Wilmar, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3222. Also, petition of Roselma B. Riggs, of Garvey, Calif., and 68 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3223. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the East Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3224. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Celia B. Zaner and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3225. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution by the subcommittee of the California guayule rubber committee, at San Francisco, Calif., recommending that the Rubber Reserve Corporation contract for the production and purchase of guayule and that the present

emergency rubber project of the United States Department of Agriculture be made the agent of the Rubber Reserve Corporation to represent them in making such contracts, and that a price be determined for the delivery of rubber produced from the guayule shrub at the end of 1, 2, 3, 4, or other agreed number of years, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3226. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce of Oswego, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of Hon. Francis D. Culkin; to the Committee on Memorials.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O faithful Shepherd who dost neither slumber nor sleep, we are the people of Thy pasture and the sheep of Thy hand; in Thy will is our freedom; Thy rod and Thy staff comfort and keep us. Until Thou, good Shepherd, dost capture our hearts, wandering without direction on the plains of peril, we mistake the license which enslaves for the liberty which makes free indeed.

We would remember that other sheep Thou hast which are not of our fold. For all Thy people hasten the day of deliverance, when there shall be one shepherd and one fold in a common unity against the wolves of want and fear, tyranny and exploitation. May we so guard the treasures of our freedom, bought with a great cost, that we will not allow the fight for freedom to destroy the freedom for which we fight. May the crimson threads of today's fearful sacrifice be woven into the very fabric of society in a fairer pattern of opportunity and equality for all. We ask it in the Saviour's Name. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1943.  
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUCAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

# MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 25, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; and

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|              |                 |               |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Andrews      | Gillette        | Pepper        |
| Bailey       | Guffey          | Radcliffe     |
| Ball         | Hatch           | Reed          |
| Bankhead     | Hawkes          | Revercomb     |
| Barkley      | Hayden          | Reynolds      |
| Bilbo        | Hill            | Robertson     |
| Brewster     | Holman          | Russell       |
| Bridges      | Johnson, Calif. | Scruggs       |
| Brooks       | Johnson, Colo.  | Shipstead     |
| Buck         | Kilgore         | Smith         |
| Burton       | Langer          | Stewart       |
| Bushfield    | Lodge           | Taft          |
| Butler       | Lucas           | Thomas, Idaho |
| Byrd         | McClellan       | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper       | McFarland       | Thomas, Utah  |
| Caraway      | McKellar        | Tunnell       |
| Chavez       | McNary          | Vandenberg    |
| Clark, Idaho | Maybank         | Van Nuys      |
| Connally     | Mend            | Wagner        |
| Danaher      | Millikin        | Walsh         |
| Davis        | Murdock         | Wheeler       |
| Downey       | Murray          | Wherry        |
| Eastland     | Nye             | White         |
| Ellender     | O'Daniel        | Wiley         |
| Ferguson     | O'Mahoney       | Willis        |
| George       | Overton         | Wilson        |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOSBY] is necessarily absent on public matters.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## DRAFT DEFERMENT OF - GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (H. DOC. NO. 343)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, October 25, 1943.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There has recently been much loose and harmful talk about the employees of the Federal Government. In an effort to discredit those in the public service, groundless charges are being made and irresponsible rumors circulated that the Federal Government is a haven for draft dodgers and slackers.

In simple justice to the many fine, public-spirited, and devoted persons in the Government employ, these unfair accusations must be emphatically denied.

Here are the true facts concerning the draft deferment of Government employees. I am sending them to you so that they may be made a part of the permanent record.

On July 31, 1943—the latest date for which complete figures are available—there were in the Government service 2,825,904 full-time employees, men and women, in the continental United States, less than 9 percent of whom work in Washington. According to the latest available information, it is estimated that there were 154,500 additional civilian employees outside the continental United States, the greater part of whom were working for the War and Navy Departments or for the Panama Canal.

In addition, there were 145,808 part-time paid employees, such as consultants, specialists, and forest-fire fighters. Two hundred fifty-one thousand six hundred and sixty-three persons were working without compensation or for \$1 a year, such as members of local ration and draft boards and industrial advisors. It has been the Government's policy not to seek deferments for part-time or uncompensated employees or for dollar-a-year men. We can thus at the outset dispose of about 400,000 persons who under no circumstances can be regarded as draft dodgers.

Of the 2,825,904 full-time, paid civilian employees in the United States, 1,952,700 men and women, or more than two-thirds, are employed by the War and Navy Departments. Let us consider first these civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments.

The greater part of them are engaged in war production in Government arsenals, ordnance plants, powder factories, and navy yards, or in essential work at Government depots, warehouses, proving grounds, air bases, naval training stations, and Government hospitals. They consist of engineers, draftsmen,

mechanics, skilled artisans, procurement experts, scientists, specialists, and administrative personnel. They perform many difficult and important functions with regard to the far-flung supply, production, and other problems of the Army and Navy.

If the items of war material now being made in these Government-owned plants were produced, instead, in civilian-owned plants, the working men and women would be the very same civilians—and in the same number. And they would be deferred as essential war workers the same as other essential war workers are deferred.

Those who constantly bemoan the rapid growth of Government pay rolls usually overlook the fact that it takes hundreds of thousands of men and women to produce guns and ammunition in Government arsenals and to construct and repair battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines in Government navy yards, the same as in privately owned and operated plants. One hundred percent of the battleships now in construction, 43 percent of the aircraft carriers, 10 percent of the cruisers, 8 percent of the destroyers, and about 31 percent of the submarines are being built in these Government yards. Our civilian workers make 86 percent of the Garand rifles built in this country. These are just a few examples.

The War and Navy Departments, like private manufacturers, must see to it that production is not disrupted by the drafting of their workers before systematic arrangements for their replacement are made. Accordingly replacement schedules, similar to those used in private war plants and factories, have been prepared for most Army and Navy civilian workers. Deferments for such workers in these departments operate on the same basis as in private industry, viz, the deferment lasts for a limited period of time, during which new people—women or older men or younger boys—are trained to take the place of those who are inducted into the Army or Navy, except those who are indispensable and irreplaceable. These replacement schedules have to be approved by the Selective Service System before they become effective.

The vast majority of these 1,952,700 civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments consist of women, men below or over draft age, men who have been classified as physically unfit, and fathers. According to the records of Selective Service, less than 5 percent of all of the civilian employees in these departments, or about 84,000, have been deferred for occupational reasons. Men of draft age are constantly being released for military duty and are being replaced in accordance with replacement schedules. This record is much better than the occupational deferments in private industry.

Those civilians in the Army and Navy who have been deferred are preponderantly workers in the field outside of Washington. Thus, of the 36,672 departmental employees of the War Department in Washington, 364 are now de-



ferred. Of the 19,000 departmental employees of the Navy in Washington, only 1,016 are now deferred. Those deferred are primarily engineers, draftsmen, naval architects, and other technical personnel.

If the slackers are not harbored by the War and Navy Departments, have they found their haven in the other Government departments and agencies?

No employee in the other Government departments and agencies is allowed to request his own deferment from his local draft board. No local draft board is allowed to defer any Government employee on occupational grounds unless the deferment has been requested by the employing agency and has received the approval of an independent Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees consisting of three public officials and organized by Executive order.

Deferment will be approved by this Review Committee only in the case of Government employees who occupy key positions, or who are engaged in highly specialized and essential work or who possess unique fitness and skill which are difficult to replace. The concept of a key position is narrowly limited to positions requiring an unusual degree of responsibility and specialized skill, and involving serious difficulty of replacement.

It is clear, therefore, that the standards of deferment of Government workers are much stricter than those governing deferments in private employment. A worker in private industry, unlike the Government employee, may request his own deferment, even though his employer does not see fit to do so. There is no agency in private industry comparable to this Review Committee of the Government which passes upon job classifications and carefully scrutinizes claims for deferment of workers. Nor, in private industry, is deferment limited to employees who hold key positions. Finally, the fact that the worker is engaged in any of the 2,000 occupations classified as essential by the War Manpower Commission may properly be considered by the local draft boards in the case of private workers; but, despite the fact that Government service has been classified as an essential activity, the local draft boards cannot defer a man in Government service, not on a replacement schedule, except in accordance with the foregoing rules. The Government, moreover, is handicapped by the fact that, due to budgetary limitations, it cannot always take on and train new employees to replace men who are about to be inducted.

I am informed that some local boards, on their own initiative, have granted occupational deferments to some Government employees without any prior request of the Government. Many of these deferments were obtained before the Executive order establishing the Review Committee was issued. These deferments are now unauthorized. We are actively searching out such cases and when they are discovered, appropriate action is being taken.

The figures compiled by the Review Committee reflect the strictness of the

Government's policy on occupational deferments.

The Post Office Department is the largest employer in the Government after the War and Navy Departments. It has 315,741 employees, of whom 307,817 are located outside of Washington. These are the men who deliver the mail and operate local post offices. No deferments have been sought by the postal authorities for any employees with the single exception of postal inspectors. These inspectors are engaged in highly skilled work requiring years of experience. They investigate postal frauds, check the accounts of the local postmasters, and do important work for the Army and Navy. Only 61 men—all of them postal inspectors—have received deferments. Twelve of these 61 are fathers. The number deferred is, therefore, less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total Post Office personnel.

The Post Office certainly does not look like a haven for draft dodgers.

Of the remaining Government employees, nearly half are women. About 119,380 are men of draft age (exclusive of a few small agencies whose reports have not yet been submitted). Of these men, 25,537 are single, 26,195 are married without children, and 67,648 are married with children.

Let us turn first to the 25,537 single men. By August 15, 1943, 3,582 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction, ready to go into the armed forces; 11,667 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service; and 1,502 had been given a class III classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 2,743. The lack of information with respect to the classification of these employees is due, in part, to the failure of some individual employees to report promptly to the Government their induction or any change in their draft status, and to the delays involved in compiling figures received from the field. Occupational deferments had been received by only 6,043.

I should like to analyze these 6,043 somewhat more in detail:

A. One thousand and seventy-seven of these are in the Department of Commerce;

One hundred and ninety in the Bureau of Standards are engaged in scientific work of prime importance to the war;

One hundred and thirty-nine in the Weather Bureau are meteorologists or weather observers;

One hundred and seventy-eight in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are engaged in exploration and mapping of coastal-defense waters;

Five hundred and fifty-four in the Civil Aeronautics Administration operate the network of Federal airways used almost exclusively now by Army and Navy aircraft;

Thirteen in the United States Patent Office are physicists, chemists, and scientists, studying patents of potential value in this mechanized war;

Three are bureau chiefs.

B. There are 1,225 single men in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who are in class II. These agents investigate cases of espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities, and perform other duties so intimately related to the war that they might easily be considered members of the armed forces.

C. Another 1,800 employed by various agencies and departments are overseas, many in actual combat zones. These consist mainly of employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, charting north Pacific waters, civil aeronautical personnel engaged in air traffic control and airways communications, radio monitor operators, operating railway workers, F. B. I. agents, operating and maintenance employees of the Panama Canal, technicians, engineers, pilots, members of the Foreign Diplomatic Service and representatives of foreign economic agencies.

D. Among the other deferred are 132 radio operators and radio technicians in the Federal Communications Commission, 387 engineers and geologists in the Department of the Interior, 352 specialists in the Department of Agriculture engaged in the inspection of food, the growing of guayule for rubber, in the protection of our national forests, or in the protection of our farms against plant or animal disease, 60 inspectors protecting our borders against illegal entry or smuggling; 60 scientists in the United States Public Health Service or the United States Food and Drug Administration; 278 scientists, engineers, and chemists in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority engaged in construction of flood-control dams and the building and operation of power plants; and 84 in the Maritime Commission supervising our ship-construction program.

This accounts for 5,455 of the 6,043 deferred single men. The remaining deferred employees occupy key positions in the various departments and agencies.

If the normal experience of Selective Service holds true with this group, about 40 percent would be ineligible, anyway, for military service by reason of their physical condition.

Nonproduction Federal employees abroad, i. e., those not engaged in actual production of war materials or facilities, are now being individually examined by the review committee to make certain that those only physically unfit for military service or those possessing exceptional qualifications are granted continued deferment.

The same holds true of the 26,195 married men without children in the Government employ. Of these 26,195 men, 5,287 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction on August 15, 1943, 6,730 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service, and 5,635 had been given a class III classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 594.

The number deferred for occupational reasons was 7,949. Like the single men, they are all engaged in work essential to the prosecution of the war, and their

cases have been carefully examined by the review committee. Here, too, about 40 percent would be found ineligible for military service by reason of their physical condition.

There are, besides, 2,003 uniformed personnel running the War Shipping Administration training organization and 14,050 cadets receiving training in the training organization schools for service in the merchant marine, who have also been deferred. These men are not really part of the civilian establishment of the Government.

The broad, over-all, unfounded charges of "draft dodgers" in Government service are particularly unfair to our Federal personnel. I am convinced that they are anxious to put on their country's uniform and that they have been kept, often against their will, in their present jobs. Their Government itself, and not the men as individuals, decided that they could be more useful to its war effort where they are.

This attempted discrediting of the public service is also unfair to the many who left the Government to enter the armed forces and who plan to return to their positions after the war. Unfortunately the statistics of those ex-employees of the Government now in the armed services are incomplete, but their very number would silence the mud slingers. As of January 1, 1943, there were 238,154 Federal employees in the armed services. The estimated number today is approximately double that amount—or about a half million.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

#### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENTAL OFFICES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate letters from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget (Executive Office of the President), the Acting Director, Office of Civilian Defense (Office for Emergency Management), the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS—PETITIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of Honolulu, T. H., praying for the enactment of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

#### HOSPITALIZATION AND CARE OF ALL WAR VETERANS—RESOLUTIONS OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have embodied in the Record two resolutions from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions

will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

#### To the Committee on Appropriations:

Whereas due to the ever-increasing number of applicants for hospitalization and domiciliary care in the various veteran facilities in the United States, by veterans of World War No. 1, the capacity of said veteran facilities are becoming inadequate; and

Whereas, due to the insurmountable number of applicants of World War No. 2 who are, and will continue to be, enrolled in the present veteran facilities, adequate room in said facilities are now overtaxed to the extent that applicants of World War No. 1 are having "No vacancies" written across their application for hospitalization: Therefore, be it—

*Resolved*, That Hillyard Post, No. 1474, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, request the Seventy-eighth Congress of these United States to appropriate \$500,000,000 to be earmarked and placed at the disposal of the Veterans' Administration for the building and equipping of adequate veteran facilities, for the increasing number of applicants for hospitalization and domiciliary care.

#### To the Committee on Finance:

Whereas it being a fact that there are numerous Federal hospitals built and in operation throughout the United States to provide convalescence of servicemen of World War No. 2; and

Whereas due to the state of emergency caused by World War No. 2, an inadequate condition has arrived that in some States there are no facilities available for hospitalization and domiciliary care of veterans of other wars; and

Whereas it is a fact that there are many vacant beds in these convalescent hospitals, idle medical staff, nurses, orderlies, and other attendants on the pay roll in these Federal hospitals: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Department of Washington, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do request the Congress of these United States, by an act, do authorize the use of Federal hospitals by the Veterans' Administration of these United States, for veterans of the past and future wars declared by this Government. Said use for those veterans in need of hospitalization and domiciliary care.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 25, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn;

S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 604. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; and

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

James W. Johnson, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the third dis-

trict of New York, in place of Joseph T. Higgins, resigned; and

Thomas M. Carey, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John J. Barc, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan; and

Jack R. Caulfield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon, vice Steve Franklin Hamm, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

John J. Haggerty, of Maryland, to be comptroller, Post Office Department, vice William L. A. Slattery; and

Sundry postmasters.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF WRIGHT BROTHERS—JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution of the Senator from Ohio will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90), expressing on the fortieth anniversary the gratitude of the Nation on the achievement of the Wright brothers in making a heavier-than-air machine was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, House bill 2924, to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada, to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have in my hand a letter from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, which states that such action is agreeable to him. A bill which I believe is almost identical is already pending before the Foreign Relations Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change of reference will be made as requested by the Senator from Texas.

#### COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. EASTLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### USE OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS AND CITY LETTER CARRIERS INTERCHANGEABLY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Postmaster General may, in an emergency, when the interest of the Service



requires, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency, when the interest of the Service requires, may temporarily assign any post-office clerk or city delivery carrier to the duties of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office clerk or city delivery carrier without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporarily assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

SEC. 2. This act shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY AT ANNUAL MEETING OF INDEPENDENT TIRE DEALERS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Independent Tire Dealers, held at New York City, N. Y., on October 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROGRESS OF THE WAR AND THE SOLDIERS' RIGHT TO VOTE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of voting by soldiers, delivered by Senator Lucas before the National Association of Secretaries of State, at St. Louis, Mo., on October 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### HOUSE CLEANING IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "What America Needs Most Is a Thorough House Cleaning in Washington," delivered by him on October 25, 1943, and a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 86, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON BEFORE PRO AMERICA ORGANIZATION OF WOMEN

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON before the Pro America Organization of Women, at Newark, N. J., on October 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY RESOLUTIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATCH

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Post-War Foreign Policy Resolutions," delivered by Senator HATCH, on October 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### STATEMENT BY WAR DEPARTMENT ON ADMINISTRATION OF PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMPS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the administration of prisoner-of-war camps, prepared by the War Department under date of October 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS BY FOREIGN GROUPS—STATEMENT BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, superintendent of the International Reform Federation, relative to

the sale of intoxicating liquors by foreign groups, as proposed by Senate bill 1338, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TEXAS NATURAL GAS SHOULD BE KEPT AND USED IN TEXAS

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Texas Natural Gas Should Be Kept and Used in Texas," prepared by Mr. W. N. Blanton, executive vice president of the Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PASSING OF MONARCHY—EDITORIAL FROM THE JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Monarchs," published in the New York Journal-American of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ARMY, COLLEGES, AND COMMUNISM—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Army, Colleges, and Communism," published in the New York World-Telegram of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATIONS—LETTER FROM C. E. CHILDE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of Freight Rate Discriminations, addressed to him under date of October 21, 1943, by C. E. Childe, member, Board of Investigation and Research, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COMMENT BY DOROTHY THOMPSON ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S TRANSPORTATION SPEECH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson commenting on the recent address on transportation problems delivered by the Vice President at Dallas, Tex., published in her column "On the Record" in the Washington Evening Star of October 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION—ARTICLE BY BARNET NOVER

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "We Are on Our Way," written by Barnet Nover, and published in the Washington Post of October 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WIN THE PEACE WHILE WINNING THE WAR—STATEMENT BY A. D. QUAINANCE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by A. D. Quainance, of Denver, Colo., with respect to the organization of the United Nations of the World, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to an editorial entitled "Legislative Sabotage," which was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The editorial appeared in the Washington Post, the issue of October 22, since the Senate voted on the so-called Federal school-aid bill.

I should like to commend the Post's straightforward and clear-out analysis of the sorry action that ended the Sen-

ate's consideration of the aid-to-education bill last week. Let me repeat the editorial's comment on the opponents of the measure who shuddered so violently over the spectre of Federal control:

First they amended the bill to make it fit their accusations. Then they applied the garrote.

It is a bitter irony that the amendment which undermined and defeated the bill was offered as an assurance to an element of our people and a region of our land whose need for the benefits of the bill were greatest. For me this irony has a further embittering twist in that the amendment, which would have in effect undertaken to readjust, indeed, to revolutionize the relationship between the white and colored races of the South, against the will of both, was offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], in whose State of almost three-quarters of a million population, there live but 201 Negroes.

This issue of the reconstruction period had a strange resurrection. The Negroes of the South were not to be taken in this time by any "40-acres-and-a-mule" slogan. They knew that the Langer amendment was not calculated to improve the southern interracial accommodation. They knew it was not calculated to increase the share of money for the education of colored people. The responsible Negro educational leadership were mindful of reconstruction history; they remembered the history of carpetbag crusaders; they knew the Langer amendment was offered but to kill the bill.

Paraphrasing a sentence of the Post editorial, I should like to say to the Members of this body that while the causes for the defeat of this bill may have been sectional, the consequences of its defeat will be national.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], I wish to serve notice that later this afternoon I will offer for the RECORD an editorial from a leading newspaper of South Carolina and a letter from the State of Tennessee.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, exactly 29 minutes ago the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Legislative Sabotage," from the Washington Post, and made a little speech thereon. I stated at that time that I would quote an editorial from South Carolina and a letter from Tennessee. In reply to the Senator from Tennessee I shall first read the letter from Tennessee:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., September 22, 1943.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I wish to thank you for the amendment sponsored by you in the Federal teachers' aid bill. Many people have been following this fight and, win or lose, many poor people thank you. I am speaking of simple people like me, people who are fighting for the right to be just people.

Respectfully yours,

LEE J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, I have before me an editorial from the News and Courier, a

daily of Charleston, S. C., of Friday morning, October 22. The editorial is entitled "Sound and Honest," and I respectfully call it to the attention of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and ask them to read the remarks they made after the majority of the Senate had voted 40 to 37 in favor of my amendment. I also call the attention of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] to the editorial. I emphasize to these Senators the fact that the editorial comes from the South. I now read the editorial:

#### SOUND AND HONEST

The amendment of Senator LANGER prohibiting racial discrimination in the spending of money to be appropriated by Congress for schools, which has "killed the bill," was a sound, an honest amendment. The southern Negroes are citizens. To appropriate from the national Treasury money for citizens' schools and leave to States the "right" to discriminate against some of the citizens would have been mean, disgraceful. Too many southern Congressmen have been supporting this measure. The Langer amendment has turned them against it. It has exposed them. It has made them ridiculous. Once the Federal Government shall begin to spend money for schools, it should and will know how the money is spent. It has no right in law or morals to permit discrimination in the spending of it, and the effect of the Langer amendment on southern Senators is proof that they expected their States to get the money and to engage in the discrimination. The News and Courier has opposed the \$300,000,000 Federal appropriation for schools because Federal interference with schools was necessarily implied by it. That would be ruinous to the South. Southern Congressmen could not see so plain a thing. Senator LANGER has conferred a benefit on the South. He has saved Southern States from making another sale of themselves for a song—or a sop.

Mr. President, in view of what the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee said earlier today:

The responsible Negro educational leadership were mindful of reconstruction history; they remembered the history of carpetbag crusaders; they knew the . . . amendment was offered but to kill the bill.

I serve notice now that tomorrow at the first opportunity which may be afforded me, I shall present to the Senate quotations from leading Negro organizations of the United States of America.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1151) to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2886) to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion, training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills,

in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1951. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; and

H. R. 3313. An act to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 1951. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; and

H. R. 3313. An act to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended.

#### COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY], inserting after line 9 a new section.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the forceful and eloquent statements made yesterday by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have in my judgment made out a case for the resolution now pending before the Senate. I do not hope, I cannot hope, to add to the weight and persuasiveness of their presentation. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee which labored through long weeks with the problem presented by the several resolutions submitted to us. I joined in the report of the subcommittee, and I voted in the full committee for favorable committee action. In the circumstances, it seems proper to me to place before the full Senate the considerations which determined my committee votes.

Mr. President, I had original regret that any of these resolutions was before the Senate, and for a long while there was in my mind substantial doubt as to the wisdom of Senate action upon any of them. Certainly the President, upon whom rests the burden of initiation of policy and of negotiation in the field of foreign problems, has not asked us to assume his obligations in this regard or to advise him with respect thereto. New England ancestry and New England teachings cautioned me against forcing upon another unsought advice. I felt strongly, too, that we could not, in the changing present and with respect to an uncertain future, chart a course that

might have in it greater danger of error than promise of good.

But Mr. President, the anxious study given to the various resolutions from which was evolved the committee's draft, or the Connally draft, and the thoughts with respect to the problem made known to the committee by many persons of high estate, and my desire for unanimity in committee recommendation persuaded me that I should join in the support of the resolution before the Senate. I give it my unqualified approval, and, as will the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, I shall oppose all amendments to it. I take this somewhat extreme attitude in opposition to amendments through no pride of participation in the committee's work, but because of my conviction that if we attempt to redraft this resolution upon this floor, we shall find ourselves in troubled waters, sailing an uncharted sea, with no known haven of safety. Mr. President, already a flood of amendments impend. Already the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida has in its few days of life undergone substantial change in form and substance. I venture the assertion that further study of this language by its proponents will bring further suggestions of change. I repeat, if we undertake the writing of this resolution upon this floor, we may bring forth a document for which all may wish to deny responsibility.

Mr. President, what is the purpose of all these resolutions? I think they represent the effort of Senators to state the great objectives of these United States in this war effort and in the world which is to follow the cessation of hostilities. I believe they are all an effort to state the aspirations of the people of our country. Does the resolution of the committee do this? I assert that it does.

First, Mr. President, the Senate is asked to resolve that the war against all our enemies shall be waged until complete victory is achieved. Is not this the first and great objective of America? Is it not clearly and affirmatively stated? Who would be satisfied with less? Who would ask for more?

Second, the resolution declares it is the purpose of the Senate to have the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and an honorable peace. Does not this objective commend itself to all? The thought might be expressed in many different words and phrases by many Senators, but would not their efforts arrive ultimately at precisely the same result? And if this be so, should we not unitedly accept this language upon which the committee so long studied?

Third, the Senate is asked to resolve that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Here to be sure is general language, but there are definite objectives clearly stated, and these are the prevention of aggression and the preservation of the



peace of the world. Again I ask, Is not this what the mothers and fathers and boys of America want? I venture that the people of our country have but a remote interest in the steps by which we attain these beneficent ends. The resolution suggests appropriate means by and through which these hopes may be realized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement, I shall be glad to yield to him.

I believe in respect for our constitutional processes. The resolution seeks to assure this regard. I would welcome our joinder with free and sovereign nations in establishing international authority to prevent aggression and to preserve peace. I want this authority, whatever its specific form or title, to have power appropriate and necessary to achieve our declared ends. I do not welcome efforts to amplify or to particularize as to the ways and means to be employed. I would not obscure the objectives or embarrass negotiations of the future by an excess of particularity now.

Mr. President, may I call to the Senate's attention an objection of moment, so it seems to me, to efforts to write this resolution in terms of specifications. What will be done at the peace conference will be determined there and not here. Whatever we write in a resolution is in the nature of authority to the President in his conduct of our foreign relations so far as the Senate can give it, and it is equally, in its definite terms, a limitation upon the President's freedom of action. And not only will it partake of the nature of a directive to the President, but it will as well inform other nations of what we expect of our representatives at the peace table. I do not believe it will contribute to a full and free conference of nations. I do not believe it will add to the effectiveness of our negotiators, if we announce to Great Britain and Russia and to all other free and sovereign nations that they must accept the machinery and the means proposed by amendments now pending before us for the working out of the problems of the world to be. I repeat, these will be the achievements or the failures of the peace conference.

Mr. President, the people of the State of Maine want this country to face the world unafraid; they would have America's voice raised in behalf of international law, codified, expanded, vitalized; they want a world of law, of order, of security, and of peace. Mr. President, they believe that such a world means a happier, a better, a richer life for all mankind. They want America, their children, and the generations yet unborn to share these blessings. They are willing to bear their part of the burdens involved in the attainment of these ends. They will sustain the President of the United States and all others in authority as they strive for the realization of these ideals.

Mr. President, I know of no greater contribution we here gathered can make to humankind than promptly to pass

this resolution. Let the world know that the Senate of the United States stands united in this declaration of glorious purpose.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought I understood the able Senator to speak of assurance that there would be adequate power to carry out the objectives of the resolution. What power does the Senator contemplate would be possessed by this international authority, which might prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world?

Mr. WHITE. I think that is a matter to be determined by the nations when they meet. I assume that an authority will be set up, or that existing authority will be used, and that one or the other, or both, will have conferred upon them the power to do, as I expressed it, whatever may be necessary and appropriate to the attainment of the ends.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator contemplate that this international authority, which by the terms of the Connally resolution would have the power to preserve peace and to prevent aggression, would be vested with an international police force?

Mr. WHITE. The future must answer as to whether it is to have an international police force or not. Personally I believe that if we are to do this job effectively in future years, there must be a military force to effectuate the conclusions at which the governing body may arrive.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has been very kind. Will he yield once more?

Mr. WHITE. I yield once more. I see trouble looming up on my left. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator believe that the pending resolution fairly informs Senators that they are voting for this international authority to have a police force or military power at its disposal?

Mr. WHITE. I cannot answer definitely for other Senators, but I know what it means to me, and I believe that it means substantially the same thing to the other members of the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator said something about trouble on his left. I assure him that I rise in the utmost good faith. I think I know something of what the Senator believes as to international relationships, and what the part of this country is to be in years to come. I respect those views, and perhaps agree with him 100 percent. However, something which he said just now caused me to rise. If he can, I wish he would enlighten me. The Senator said that the resolution was, first, a declaration of war aims. I thought that was all the Senator had in mind. That shows the benefit of waiting until the Senator had finished. Later in his remarks he said that it was in the nature of advice to the President.

Mr. WHITE. I think that is the constitutional invitation which comes to us,

and I assume that the resolution is in response to the constitutional suggestion, although I did say—and I think it is true—that the President had not asked us for advice, and that I was brought up to look with suspicion on unsought advice.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator then said that the resolution was in the nature of a grant of authority, or advice to the President.

Mr. WHITE. I assume the President will take notice of the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator also said that it was in the nature of a limitation. I am particularly interested to know what limitation would be placed on the President by this resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I am not timid about the resolution as it was reported from the committee; but the thought I wish to convey is that as we particularize in a resolution, if the President gives any heed to it at all, we limit the sweep of the President's discretion.

Mr. HATCH. If limitations are to be placed, by amendments or otherwise, then certainly the original resolution has the same force of limiting the powers of the President to the confines of the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; except that it is pretty general language.

Mr. HATCH. It amounts to a warning, perhaps, to other nations of the world. What I am trying to find out—and I merely wish the Senator's opinion—is what limitation, if any, would be placed on the right of the President by the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I do not say that there is such a limitation in the resolution as reported by the committee; but I think that every time we go into details, add a qualifying phrase, or incorporate new matter in the resolution, we step over into the Presidential prerogative and advise him to follow the Senate rather than his own inclinations.

Mr. HATCH. From the answers which the Senator has just given, I interpret his meaning to be that under the resolution as reported by the committee there is in reality no limitation upon the President by the language of the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I think that is true. I think it states outstanding objectives and that is about all it does. It pledges our loyalty to the principle of constitutional process. But aside from that, it is a statement which is reasonably clear to me of the major objectives of this country.

Mr. HATCH. It is not intended as a limitation upon the powers of the President, or as a warning to other countries that he is limited to the confines of this particular resolution?

Mr. WHITE. I believe I have answered the question to the best of my ability.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Maine knows the high respect which I have held for him, particularly for his

ability as a draftsman of legislation, during all the time I have been a Member of the Senate.

I was somewhat surprised by his statement that under the present circumstances he would not accede to any amendment to the pending resolution, no matter how good the amendment might be. Does the Senator feel that the fourteen Senators, including myself, should not take with regard to our amendment, the same position he has taken with regard to the resolution reported by the committee?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not wish to assume the privilege of advising other Senators. I will allow the Senator's own conscience to be his guide. However, as it came from the subcommittee, the pending resolution, represented the composite view of the members supporting it in the subcommittee. Many of us yielded something of our own inclinations in order that we might present a united report from the subcommittee to the full committee. I am anxious at this time that the Senate in the action it takes shall present to the world as complete unanimity as it is possible to bring about. I will give the Senator advice because I believe he has asked for it. If the Senator wants my advice, it is that he and others having like mind should yield, as some of the others of us did in the committee, their present inclinations and make the pending resolution a unanimous declaration of the people of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has referred to concessions which were made by various members of the subcommittee. Did his statement include the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WHITE. It most assuredly did. The Senator from Texas was patient and courteous, and he gave of his great abilities to the effort to frame a resolution upon which we could all stand, and which could be presented to the world as the united voice of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As the Senator knows, the junior Senator from Ohio joined three other Senators in the submission of a resolution on March 16, 1943.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator also knows that in the consideration of the resolution by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Maine is a member, the four Senators to whom I have referred, who submitted Senate Resolution 114, have yielded to the views of others, or have modified their views, and have endeavored to go as far as they could toward meeting the situation, and have now submitted an amendment to Senate Resolution 192, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Therefore, it seems to me that Senators who are not members of the Foreign Relations Committee should have the same opportunity to present their convictions that has been accorded to members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have not suggested to anyone that debate should be curtailed. I am perfectly willing that the debate continue indefinitely. But I cannot help remarking that I hope that in the end the Senator will get his conscience under control, and that he will do what I recommend, namely, unite with the proponents of the pending resolution in giving to the world a showing of unanimity.

Mr. BURTON. What I wished to inquire about was the Senator's statement that he felt he could not accept any amendment to the original resolution, no matter how good it might be.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator has put language into my mouth that I did not use, but I do not object to it.

Mr. BURTON. I used the words "no matter how good."

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. The point is this: Suppose the amendment presented by the 14 Senators through the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] should be adopted by a majority of the Senate; would the Senator from Maine decline to vote for the resolution as amended?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is undertaking to commit me to something in the future. I will meet the problem when I have to. I am not looking for trouble. I have found enough of it already.

Mr. BURTON. But there is at least the possibility that under the circumstances I have mentioned the Senator might not vote for the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I should then face the alternative of taking a negative attitude and voting against the resolution as amended, or going along with it. I will labor with that problem when I come to it.

Mr. BURTON. We are faced with the choice either of voting for a resolution which means very little, or an amendment to it which would make it of substantial value.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot agree with the Senator's premise. I think the amendment in its present form is subject to serious objections. I have not undertaken to analyze it on the floor of the Senate, but I believe that before the time for voting arrives the Senators themselves will alter the amendment.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, in the formative days of this Republic it was possible for us to be isolated because of the great wide oceans which separated us from other nations. Ocean travel was long, arduous, and dangerous.

That isolation has long since vanished. It gradually diminished because of the advent of ships operated by steam, resulting in speedy passage. Then came the airplane. The day the first airplane crossed the ocean marked the end of the doubtful isolation which we once enjoyed.

Isolation is simply a matter of transportation. There is no isolated spot if it can be reached speedily. It is said that even now there is no place in the world which cannot be reached within a space of 60 hours from any major airport. It should take no other statement

than this to prove that isolation for America is archaic. But, Mr. President, air transportation is yet in its infancy. No one can envisage its future.

Today there are flying war machines which can easily and speedily cross the ocean carrying death and destruction as their cargo. It is a wonder that the Capitol in which we serve has not suffered from German air raids. In every room in this building, even now, there are warnings with instructions what to do in case of a raid.

In the tomorrow this danger will be multiplied many times. It would be possible for great air fleets carrying death-dealing missiles to lay waste this and other great American cities. If we here now permit to fall an effort to prevent such a catastrophe, we accept a responsibility too great to be considered.

Despite the efforts of a great President to prevent it we could not avoid entry in the last World War. Woodrow Wilson knew that should another war occur, we would not be able to remain aloof. He sought to prevent this by the formation of a league of nations which would provide for international cooperation in preventing war. It was largely our fault that this effort failed.

There is a growing number who believe that had his plan of international cooperation for peace been given a trial, the present terrible conflict would have been avoided.

Instead of joining in international cooperation to preserve peace, we again reverted to isolationism. We went even further than that. We entered upon a well meaning but totally fallacious policy of disarmament. We sank our ships and almost disbanded our Army. Other nations joined in somewhat the same course.

This weakening of military strength of the United States, France, and England gave the dictator nations their opportunity. Japan, long covetous of areas owned by other nations, began her theft of these lands. The objective was accomplished with such ease that Japan sought to expand her robberies.

Mussolini, once of Italy, taking a leaf out of the book of the Japanese, also traveled the same road of international burglary. He was successful for a time, even though his efforts were the greatest bluff in history.

This situation was made to order for the Prussian military machine. It permitted them to rearm and rebuild for the day when they would make another attempt against the peace and security of the world.

The result was that the time intervening between the signing of the last peace treaty and the beginning of the present war was simply an armistice period which the Nazis used to their advantage. If we fail to heed this record now and decline to seek to collaborate with our allies to prevent other dictators from again plunging the world into war, the time intervening between the victorious peace which is to come and the next conflict will be but another armistice. Again war will come. Again we will be drawn into it.



Mr. President, the ink was scarcely dry upon the signatures to the last treaty of peace until the German war machine was again at work to rearm for the next attempt against the peace of the world. One of the most valuable assets of those in Germany who framed the next assault was the most skillful propaganda machine the world has ever known. It was of great aid in avoiding the penalties of defeat. Such was the power of this propaganda that the world was caused to feel so sorry for Germany, that it has been said that instead of that nation making reparation payments, the victors were paying Germany.

Our Nation was not the only one adversely affected by the German propaganda machine. So insidious was its work that France and other nations were undermined in military strength and morals. They fell easy prey to the German war machine. Much of the areas overrun and captured by the Nazis in the early part of the war was accomplished with but little loss in material and men. Preparations for war in England and the United States were so delayed that we met defeat after defeat, simply because our aid was too little and too late.

This propaganda became so arrogant that Hitler boasted he could render the United States impotent by its use. That we could never be united sufficiently to successfully oppose him; that he could cause revolution within our borders. This was a boastful threat, but he succeeded in becoming the backbone of a mighty effort to prevent preparation on the part of other nations to meet his challenge for world domination.

Those of us who served in the Congress prior to our entering this war know of the powerful opposition to each and every effort that was made to prepare for a war which was inevitable. Perhaps never before in our history was there such well-organized opposition. This included those who were sincerely opposed to war and who thought and hoped there might be a way to avoid it.

Due to the fact that I was a woman, I felt as if much of this attack was concentrated on me. Why, I do not know, for certainly there should be no difference because of sex, and there is none when the interest of our country is at stake.

This is shown by the fact that in the present war as never before in history women have taken an important part. Not only do they constitute a great number of those engaged in defense work, but they are in active service in the various women's military and naval units. When the history of this war is written, the efforts of women in industry, active service, and in the home will be one of its brightest chapters. Before I leave this subject, let me say that sometimes I wonder which of the many roles which women are playing in this war is the greatest. Sometimes I think that those who wait, worry, and fear for the safety of their loved ones have the greatest cross to bear.

Mr. President, there is no need for me to picture the horrors of war. Daily we are reading and hearing of sickening

scenes of death and destruction too terrible to contemplate. There is doubt that there has ever been such brutality shown in any war as that shown now by the Axis Nations, except perhaps in the campaigns of Attila, the Hun.

No longer is it only the fighting men who are killed and wounded. Already millions of civilians, old men, women, and children, have fallen victims. Precisely how many is not known now nor will it be known with exactness in the years after the war, but a tally of estimates for the world battle zones produces the shocking total of more than 22,000,000 civilian dead. It is to prevent the possibility of such happenings in the future that we should now do everything we possibly can to insure against it.

The economic loss caused by war is too great to compute. The peoples of the world are staggering under a war debt so large as to bend their backs and those of generations to come, in an effort to pay it. If but a small portion of the immense sums of money which have been and are being spent for this war could have been diverted to other purposes, human existence could have been made much happier. It would have been sufficient almost to banish poverty, disease, and human suffering.

Mr. President, it is to prevent the recurrence of such conditions that the pending resolution is aimed.

This resolution is not difficult to understand. It is simple in its directives. It reads:

*Resolved*, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

In the passage of this resolution we are taking a long and encouraging step forward on the road to peace. The House of Representatives has already passed, by a large majority, a resolution somewhat similar.

There is no doubt that the Senate will approve the pending resolution. When that is done, the Congress will have placed itself on record before history and the world as being in full sympathy with the principle of collective security.

Its action will indicate clearly that here there is no great isolationist reaction against post-war cooperation with the rest of the world to prevent war. It is imperative for the Senate to give prompt and overwhelming approval to such a resolution. This would unquestionably have a wholesome effect on the temper and confidence of many leaders and peoples who might doubt our intention and determination to play an adequate international role in the years to come.

If the Senate does this, there will be greater reason to hope that tomorrow's world will be made into a genuinely cooperative one instead of falling back into the dangerous old game of power politics.

Mr. President, believing as I do that the adoption of a proper resolution will have this effect and will postpone, if not forever banish, war from the world, I shall gladly cast my vote for it.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons; and

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

#### COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Chair and Senators will forgive me if I make the first words of my remarks a personal reference. My first political speech I made while I was a student in Harvard Law School, in the political campaign of Mr. Gaston, of Boston, against Senator Henry Cabot Lodge for the office of United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts, was on the issue of the League of Nations.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|              |                 |               |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Andrews      | Gillette        | Pepper        |
| Bailey       | Guffey          | Radcliffe     |
| Ball         | Hatch           | Reed          |
| Bankhead     | Hawkes          | Revercomb     |
| Barkley      | Hayden          | Reynolds      |
| Bilbo        | Hill            | Robertson     |
| Brewster     | Holman          | Russell       |
| Bridges      | Johnson, Calif. | Scrugham      |
| Brooks       | Johnson, Colo.  | Shipstead     |
| Buck         | Kilgore         | Smith         |
| Burton       | Langer          | Stewart       |
| Bushfield    | Lodge           | Taft          |
| Butler       | Lucas           | Thomas, Idaho |
| Byrd         | McClellan       | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper       | McFarland       | Thomas, Utah  |
| Caraway      | McKellar        | Tunnell       |
| Chavez       | McNary          | Vandenberg    |
| Clark, Idaho | Maybank         | Van Nuys      |
| Connally     | Mead            | Wagner        |
| Danaher      | Millikin        | Walsh         |
| Davis        | Murdock         | Wheeler       |
| Downey       | Murray          | Wherry        |
| Eastland     | Nye             | White         |
| Ellender     | O'Daniel        | Wiley         |
| Ferguson     | O'Mahoney       | Willis        |
| George       | Overton         | Wilson        |

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was saying that I rise today, as party to the amendment which is proposed to be

offered to the resolution reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, only because I believe, from the bottom of my heart, in the most effective form of international organization to promote the welfare and preserve the peace of the world. I have begun by saying that the first political speech I ever made, I made when I was a student in Harvard Law School, when I went down to join the campaign of Mr. Gaston, of Boston, a Democratic candidate against the then senior United States Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, to speak in behalf of the League of Nations against the incumbent of that high office. For some 3 months in the year 1918 I had the honor to wear the uniform of my country as an 18-year-old boy.

There was no name save that of the Master himself which meant more to me, nay, means more to me today, than the name of the great prophet, Woodrow Wilson. I grew up under the spell of Woodrow Wilson's eloquence. My own heart, with the heart of all mankind, was moved by the magic of that man's great words. And I can seem still to hear the fervent appeal of that good and great man to his fellowmen to save their sons from the scourge of war.

I can seem to see in this debate today, Mr. President, the shadows of those figures who contested with Woodrow Wilson about the League of Nations, and I cannot feel that the issue presented upon the pending question is dissimilar from the issue tragically decided in the Senate on the 19th day of March 1919. I regard, therefore, the controversy which now rages in the Senate as simply a repetition of the League of Nations fight, or I might say, a continuation of the fight between those who before Pearl Harbor believed in America taking its full and fair part in world affairs, and those who also prior to Pearl Harbor days, clung to the discredited and dangerous doctrine of isolation.

I think all of us have a feeling, Mr. President, that this is historic ground upon which we are treading; that not only the people of the United States, but nations abroad—nay, free men wherever they are at liberty to listen—have their ears attuned to what may be at last the authentic and responsible utterance of the Senate of the United States upon this question. For the world wants to know, Mr. President, whether the Senate of the United States is again going to obstruct the moral leadership of this Nation in participation in world affairs as it did in 1918, 1919, and 1920.

The world wants to know whether we, in this body, have changed our sentiment, and whether the Senate is willing manfully and clearly to say that the United States not only must, but shall effectively, perform its full part in making the world a law-abiding community. In the making of their own plans the people of the world want to know whether they may depend upon the United States of America supporting and sustaining the principle of collective security, or whether they shall have to depend upon their own strength for the integrity and protection of their respective countries.

In the chancelleries of Britain and Russia there must be many question marks about what their future course shall be, and those question marks, Mr. President, essentially relate to the uncertainty of what the United States of America will do after the war.

We have come to be regarded as courageous in war and cowardly in peace. It was not the soldiers who fought in Belleau Wood and Chateau Thierry and in the Argonne who lacked courage in 1918; it was not the fighting Americans who shirked in upholding the great traditions of this Nation, in doing our honorable part in conquering a tyrannical foe. No; it was in the Senate of the United States where men lacked courage and boldness and daring, and, Mr. President, some have feared, the sincerity of high purpose. It was not the shot and shell, Mr. President, upon those torn battlefields which made timid and frightened the representatives of the United States of America who wore their Nation's uniform; but it was the discordant, devilish, divisive sentiments and utterances from political sources in the United States that made Senators quake and unwilling to do their duty, not only to their country but to their Nation's dead and to posterity.

This has been a long fight, this fight to remove the scourge of war from the human race, and when I say from the human race, Mr. President, I mean essentially from the masses of average men and women, from the fireside of the average home. I mean, this fight to clutch the evil hand of war, which for generation after generation, as long as history has been recorded, has reached into the sanctuary of the home and torn a son from fond parents, snatched away a father from his tearful children, drawn the defender of a home from the clinging arms of a devoted wife. I say, Mr. President, that those who have tried to marshal the forces that might restrain that avaricious and bloody hand have had a long and so far, Mr. President, an unsuccessful and futile fight.

Is it because people love war? Is it because people invite it and court it? Is it because it is not ghastly and horrible? Not, Mr. President, in the opinion of those who have seen it. A Senator on this floor a few days ago told of being at an advance sector of the American front in the Solomons and of a shell exploding a few hundred yards in front of where he and others were, and of wounded, torn men being brought back and being placed in boats and transported to waiting vessels.

Mr. President, that Senator told his colleagues of the anguish of the wounded, of a man's face being shot away, of maggots forming in that man's facial wound. Is it because war is not horrible that we have so long and so futilely fought against it? Or is it because those who advocate peace have not had the courage to face the experiment of the maintenance of peace and to take the risks and the hazards involved in such trials?

Moreover, those who want war have had many things on their side. On a few occasions they have had those who profit by war to egg it on. They have

had those who sought the gratification of some vain ambition for power to encourage it. Sometimes they have had the thoughtless and the indifferent on their side, though generally, Mr. President, those forces have been united, and they have been dynamic. But the forces of peace have not only been timid; they have often lacked leadership, they have seldom had unity. They have been pulled apart and weakened by so many discordant notes and so many divisive sentiments that they never have been able to present an effective force against this aggregation which desires to wage war.

So, Mr. President, it would seem that surely sometime we might awaken to our great responsibility in such a way as that which was suggested by President Wilson when he said:

When I think of words piled on words, of debate following debate, when these unspeakable things that cannot be handled until the debate is over are happening in these pitiful parts of the world, I wonder that men do not wake up to the moral responsibility of what they are doing. Great peoples are driven out upon a desert, where there is no food and can be none, and they are compelled to die, and then men, women, and children thrown into a common grave, so imperfectly covered up that here and there is a pitiful arm stretched out to heaven, and there is no pity in the world. When shall we wake to the moral responsibility of this great occasion?

Mr. President, what we experience today is of course the fruition of history. What we suffer today is attributable, many good men and women believe, to what we have not dared to do in days past. The great war which now wages—and wars have become progressively worse—dates back probably at least to the end of the last war. Out of the chaos and confusion which followed the last war there grew up in Germany a broken democracy, and that infant struggling for existence was finally destroyed by an evil aggregation led by the most devilish and hellish of men, Adolf Hitler. I have said before upon the floor of the Senate that I saw upon the walls of public buildings in Munich in 1938, the scars of street fights in which 3,000 persons were supposed to have fallen dead in the battle between the soldiery and the Communists. Such was post-war Germany. Yet, Mr. President, it was out of the womb of those evil circumstances that Hitlerism was born. The democracies of the world seemed to think they had no responsibility to preserve that infant, the democratic government in Germany. They seemed to think the internal affairs of the German people were of no concern to men in other parts of the world. They seemed not to be aware that a threat to the liberty of people anywhere is a threat to the independence of people everywhere. They seemed not to be aware that the persecution of a minority in Germany endangered the integrity and the dignity of men all over the world. But due to the failure of the democratic nations and people of the world to protect that democratic infant, to make democracy work in Germany, there came the Nazis and, heading the Nazis, Hitler, letting loose



the scourge of war upon an unoffending and defenseless world.

So, Mr. President, if peace is to be preserved it must be by dynamic, not negative, forces. It must be by those who understand the origin and the source of war, and who strive to suppress it in its inception. For war, in the opinion of many scholars, is a recognized social institution which has grown up throughout the long past because it was the only way or the most effective way for peoples to gratify their ambitions, due to the failure of the leadership of mankind to provide any alternative method by which the legitimate aspirations, even of nations, might be achieved.

So, due to the failure of the statesmanship of the world to provide social institutions wherein international wrong might be complained of, and national redress sought—due to the failure of mankind to set up institutions which might govern the conduct of nations as well as of individuals, communities, and states, the powerful, the greedy, the ambitious have always resorted to the ready instrument of war.

Here in the Senate we have heard expressed many fears about what would be the result of our entering into some association or organization, the purpose of which should be to maintain the peace and promote the welfare of the world. Here upon this floor, Mr. President, a generation ago eloquent and determined voices were heard pointing out the danger of the League of Nations, pointing out the risk of article X of the League Covenant, pointing out the menace of article XI of the League Covenant, pointing out the exceedingly great danger of article XVI. Due to their persistence and their persuasiveness; due to the fact that the great leader of the opposition, after successfully leading the Nation in war and finally formulating a world peace, carrying it to his own fellow countrymen, and then, having made thirty-odd speeches in twenty-odd days, finally fell, a victim of overexertion, on September 26, 1919—I say, Mr. President, due to the persuasiveness and the persistence of those determined and eloquent men in the Senate of the United States, and due to the fact that the leader, the great leader, of the forces of progress and peace at last, like a great soldier who had done his due and his duty, fell a casualty of the great crusade, the Senate on the solemn day of the 19th of March 1920 defeated the League of Nations, betrayed the dead, and destroyed the hope of mankind.

So, Mr. President, when on the other side of the river the great unerring Judge shall put His finger upon those who bear the moral responsibility for the tragic present, in the humble opinion of one man of this generation that finger will not pass over the names of those who took the moral responsibility of bringing on another war in a generation.

During his tour to the West President Wilson said to a fellow citizenry, which hung upon his words, that there would be a war in 20 years. He did not realize that his prophecy would be fulfilled in less than 20 years. It was just 20 years after those utterances that global war again broke upon a pitiful world.

Great crowds met President Wilson at every station. They filled every hall and lined every street. They greeted with exaltation the hope that lay in him. That was of no avail here in the United States Senate, for it was not those masses who voted in the Senate. Their determined cry was not heard in this body. They were not members of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was stacked by a party leadership against the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, not only after it was conceived, but before the conference ever convened.

No, Mr. President. The people were not the ones who purposed to destroy a political opponent for personal political gain. It was not they who met in New York in early December of 1918 with ex-President Theodore Roosevelt and the then leader of the Senate, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and resolved upon the technique by which they would defeat the League of Nations, namely, the technique of endless debate and critical reservations.

The people of America did not know about that, Mr. President. They were not parties to it. They were not consulted in those councils. Probably they could not have done anything about it. Those whose sons were in the Army of Occupation and could not be brought home until the treaty of peace, which embraced an integral part of the League of Nations, was determined and ratified—those parents did not have a voice in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or on the floor of the Senate. Nor did those whose sons never came back from Flanders fields, who lie in foreign graves, whose blood intermingled with alien soil.

They did not seem to have a part in the debate, either, for it was not humanitarian considerations which actuated the opponents of that proposal. It must be said, in the light of impartial and cold history, that it was political chicanery, personal vanity, personal animosity toward the then President, which condemned to war another generation of boys and girls, many of whom were not yet born, and many others of whom were in their mothers' arms. They are now the soldiers of this great land, fighting on all the battle fronts of the world.

No, Mr. President, it was not those mothers and fathers who were heard when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee received, on July 10, 1919, the Treaty of Versailles and the included League of Nations Covenant and held it in committee for 6 weeks—in fact, held it in committee until public opinion seemed to demand that at least it eventually be permitted the light of day and the privilege of public consideration.

The scheme, so cleverly designed, to defeat the League of Nations, was not enunciated in public. It was not a part of the debate. Yet, Mr. President, it is a part of the history of the times. I hold in my hand a book entitled "The United States and World Organization, 1920-33," by Mr. Fleming, a professor in Vanderbilt University. On page 24 I find the following footnote:

After Borah's attack on the Covenant in the Senate, February 21, 1919, Lodge said

to him, "My dear fellow, I agree with you absolutely, absolutely, but we can't beat the thing. Eighty-five percent of the Senate are for it. The best we can do is to get changes that will emasculate it as much as possible."

I read further from the footnote:

Lodge also wrote to Beveridge on January 30th—

This was 1919—

that caution had to be exercised until the new Senate had been organized and control of the Foreign Relations Committee secured.

I read further from the footnote on page 24:

When Lodge asked Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, to direct the organization of the Senate against the League, Watson—

The Senator Watson referred to, of course, was one of the Republican leaders—

Watson thought the League could not be defeated. "Senator," he said to Lodge, "I don't see how we are ever going to defeat this proposition. It appears to me that 80 percent of the people are for it. Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now advocating it, churches are very largely favoring it, all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war, and imagine this opens a way to world peace, are for it, and I don't see how it is possible to defeat it."

Lodge replied—

Senators, listen to these Mephistophelean words:

Lodge replied, "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations."

"What do you mean by that?" Watson asked. "Illustrate it to me."

Lodge illustrated, and "then went on for 2 hours to explain other reservations, going into the details of the situation that would thus be evolved, until I became thoroughly satisfied that the treaty could be beaten in that way."

That was in February of 1919. The League Covenant had not at that time been adopted by the conference at Paris. At that time President Wilson had not returned to the United States with the treaty. At that time there was no language and no provision in the Covenant to which those Senators had any reason to object, because the League Covenant had not yet been written. Yet, sitting here in secrecy, under the honorable cloak of the Senate of the United States, the two most powerful men in this body, with utter disregard of what former Senator Watson called the hope of the oppressed everywhere that this thing might stop war, these two men, Mr. President, schemed and connived and conspired to defeat by indirection a document which they themselves had said 85 percent of the people of the United States wanted, which they said the ministers were advocating in the pulpits, and for which they said the church people all over this land were working and praying.

Mr. President, the League's opponents had a technique. That is what those men did, and time after time Senator Lodge states in his book, the Senate and the League of Nations, how he carefully evaluated the character and temperament of President Wilson to know, just like a skilled poker player, exactly what might be President Wilson's reaction to



their scheme and their strategy; and upon the very last pages of his apology Senator Lodge finally says, with some vanity, I must confess, "I did not err in my appraisal of what Wilson would do."

And so, Mr. President, without the American people even knowing about it, without them having a chance to pass on it or correct it, by the use of Senate procedures and technique, and by the power of those who controlled its committees and its conduct upon the floor, and by reason of the rule of the Senate requiring two-thirds of the Senators present to ratify a treaty, the League of Nations was defeated—this in spite of the fact that every historian who writes about it says that even up to the last day of its consideration in the Senate, not only were a distinct majority of the Senators in favor of it, but an overwhelming majority of the American people as well.

So, Mr. President, if that debate, if what the Senate did to that great document, did nothing more than to pull from this body the cover of the Senate technique, of the capacity to abuse Senate power, and turn the eyes of another generation oppressed by war upon such technique and into the recesses of every Senator's heart it might, for future generations, prove to have been worth while.

Mr. President, if this debate serves the purpose of disclosing to the American people the technique by which treaties are ratified, the power for abuse of power which Senators possess, the necessity for them literally to examine the consciences of Senators; if this debate challenges the Senate of the United States to take its full and fair part in the responsibility for what the Government shall do in world affairs in preventing World War No. 3; if what the Senate shall do as a result of this debate shall make the American people aware of by what precarious threads their peace hangs, and their assurance of World War No. 3 not coming to pass, it will have served a very honorable and a very effective purpose.

Not every one recalls, with respect to the League of Nations fight, that 9 months elapsed between the time the treaty reached the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the time when it was rejected here upon the floor of the Senate. Nine months, Mr. President, elapsed while the world waited and the Senate debated. Do we live in the same kind of world now? Does anyone believe that Mr. Stalin and his government will wait another 9 months—it might well have been 18—for the Senate of the United States to make up its mind, for those in favor of an affirmative course to overcome every obstructive opposition, before they do what they deem they should do in their own best interests? No, Mr. President, we do not live in so leisurely a world.

It is interesting to recall that from the beginning of this Republic up to the time the Treaty of Versailles was being considered by the Senate, the Senate had been engaged essentially in the consideration of bilateral treaties, that is, treaties between this and one other country. Hardly ever was it a multi-lateral, or a many-sided or a many-party treaty. Of course, the Senate has added

many amendments in treaties; it has attached a great many reservations; but, it made little difference to the world what amendments and what reservations were adopted for they were seldom matters of international moment. And so the procedures and the techniques under the Constitution developed for dealing with bilateral treaties, for the first time actually came under scrutiny and trial when the multisided, many-party Treaty of Versailles came before this body for consideration on the 10th of July 1919. Yet, Mr. President, the Senate applied to that many-sided treaty the same leisurely legislative technique—while 26 other nations waited—that it had applied to simple bilateral treaties where only one other nation was involved in the engagement.

So, Mr. President, the verdict of history is that if that is the way the Senate shall exercise its treaty-making power, it is no longer the effective instrumentality for determining that nation's foreign policy of what we are pleased to call the world's greatest power.

That conclusion, in turn, requires one of three remedies: first, that Senators individually shall face up to their moral and legislative responsibility and duly advise the Executive and other nations currently as world problems emerge, and as world situations evolve; or, second, that we abrogate the two-thirds rule of the Senate by constitutional amendment, which may be brought about either by resolution proposed by two-thirds of the Members of the Congress and approved by three-fourths of the State legislatures, or State conventions, as the Congress shall determine whether it shall be by ratification or convention; or, third, that the Senators shall swear before God and their fellow countrymen that they will not abuse the power they possess under the Constitution by defeating another treaty which proposes a decent world order betraying another generation of dead, and again dashing from hope to despair the sentiment of mankind.

Then, why this debate today? Why these resolutions before the Senate? What precipitated them? Not only, Mr. President, because we are engaged in the world's most terrible war, not only because we ought to be penitent for what we have not done before, but I venture to say that we are discussing this subject today and that these resolutions are pending here because of the overwhelming demand of American public opinion that the Senate of the United States shall let the Nation and the world know its sentiment in no equivocal or uncertain way about what it will permit to be the future of the United Nations, the United States, and the people of the world.

I have a few polls, Mr. President, which I think are reflective of that sentiment. One is hardly 72 hours old. It was conducted by the National Opinion Research, maintained by the University of Denver, which, I think, is a reliable and impartial source. The question put was as follows:

After the war, if two countries have a disagreement, do you think it would be better if some kind of organization worked with them to try to settle the disagreement?

Here are the statistics: Sixty-nine percent said, "Yes," an organization was needed; 26 percent, or approximately two and a half Americans out of every 10, felt that no international organization would be needed. So 69 responses were affirmative and 26 were negative. Five percent did not know, and that, Mr. President, is interesting, for only 5 percent of American public opinion appeared to be disinterested about this vital matter.

I refer to another poll. This was an institute poll, Mr. President, reported by the Public Opinion Quarterly, published by the School of Public Affairs at Princeton University. Here is the question which was put:

Should the countries fighting the Axis set up an international police force after the war is over to try to keep the peace throughout the world?

That poll was taken on May 10, 1943, and here are the results:

Seventy-four percent of those polled answered, "Yes"; only 14 percent answered "No," and 12 percent had no opinion.

I cite a third poll, Mr. President, this time by the Associated Press, and this time not of the country, but of the Senate. Not from the hearts of the people came these answers, but from the seclusion of the Senate of the United States. The question put by the Associated Press was the following:

Do you favor committing the Senate and the country now to a post-war course of preserving the peace through an international police force?

Here, Mr. President, is the reported result: Instead of a reflection of the affirmative opinion of 74 percent of those who were polled, only 24 Senators answered, "Yes" out of a body of 96; 32 Senators reflected the opinion of the 14 percent of the people stating they would vote "No" on the question of an international police force, and 40 Senators did not respond to the poll of the Senate, in contrast to only 12 percent of the citizenry polled who had no opinion on this vital subject.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The poll which the Senator has just read to the Senate was taken some months ago, was it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, it was taken some months ago. Let us hope, Mr. President, that the vote upon the pending amendment will indicate to what degree the Senate may have altered its heretofore disclosed sentiment.

In another poll, taken in January 1943 by a national organization, the question put was:

In addition to waging war, should the allies start talking and preparing now for the kind of peace we want after the war, or should we think and plan only for winning the war, letting the peace plans wait?

That was a pertinent and proper inquiry.



The result was: Prepare now, 59.2 percent of those polled; wait, 38.4 percent; do not know, 2.3 percent. Those who qualified their answer consisted of only one-tenth of 1 percent.

So, Mr. President, let the response to that poll be noted by those who say, "Let us tarry a while, let us wait, let us hesitate, let us debate, let us deliberate, let us reflect, let us inquire as to what others are doing or are going to do."

Remember that 59.2 percent, for whatever it may be worth, of this poll of the American people said, "Prepare now for the kind of peace we want after the war while we experience the horrors of World War No. 2. Let us, before God, assure the race that we shall not have World War No. 3."

Another poll was conducted by Fortune magazine in April of this year. The question put was:

As far as America and the rest of the world are concerned, which one of the six policies come closest to what you would like to see us do when war is over?

Six proposals were made upon which the people were asked to express themselves. The first was:

World coöperation: Form a new league or association with all different nations of the world and take active part in making it work.

And here are the answers:

Farmers, 40.3; factory workers, 34.2 percent; high-school students—high-school students, Mr. President, who would probably have to go to war—50.9 percent.

The second proposal put was:

Form a United States to include all democratic countries.

That is, a United States of the world. To that proposal only 3.5 percent of the farmers said "Yes"; only 7.5 percent of factory workers said "Yes"; and only 6.4 percent of high-school students said "Yes."

The third proposal was:

Try to form some close connection with the British Empire.

This time only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the farmers said "Yes"; only 1.8 percent of the factory workers said "Yes"; and only 1.1 percent of high-school students said "Yes."

Then, Mr. President, came the question suggesting isolation and the first proposal was:

Have as little to do as possible with any countries in Europe or Asia, but form a new United States to include in one government all North and South American countries.

Two and five-tenths percent of the farmers voted "Yes", 6.2 percent of the factory workers voted "Yes," and 3.9 percent of the high-school students voted "Yes."

The next question was, "Use our influence to try to organize the world for peace but form no ties." Twenty-three and three-tenths percent of the farmers voted "Yes," 31.4 percent of the factory workers voted "Yes," 31.2 percent of the high-school students voted "Yes."

The next question was, "Stay at home—have as little as possible to do with other nations." Only 11.7 percent

of the farmers voted "Yes," only 12 percent of the factory workers voted "Yes," only 4.2 percent of the high-school students voted "Yes."

Of those who answered the statement, "I do not know what we should do," 18 percent of the farmers said "Yes," 6.9 percent of the factory workers said "Yes," 2.3 percent of the high-school students said "Yes."

Mr. President, the significance of that poll is that the largest percentages of responses of an affirmative nature came in respect to the proposals which had the greatest strength, which contemplated the most effective world organization; and that is a very salutary observation.

Now one more. This was a poll taken by the American Institute of Public Opinion, commonly known as the Gallup Poll, and the question was, "Should the Government take steps now, before the end of the war, to set up with our allies a world organization to maintain the future peace of the world?"

The poll was taken on March 23 of this year, and this was the result. The national response was, "Yes" 64 percent, "No" 24 percent, "No opinion" 12 percent. Among Democratic voters the vote was 65 percent "Yes," 23 percent "No," and 12 percent "No opinion," and among the Republican voters 63 percent voted "Yes," showing little difference, 28 percent "No," only 3 percent difference, and 9 percent "No opinion," only 3 percent difference.

Again, Mr. President, this question was asked, "After this war, do you think the United States should stay out of world affairs, or take an active part in world affairs?"

The national response was 76 percent for taking an active part, 14 percent to stay out, 10 percent no opinion. Among the Democrats, 78 percent voted that we should take an active part, 12 percent to stay out, 10 percent no opinion, and among the Republican voters 76 percent, practically the same, to take an active part, 15 percent to stay out, 9 percent no opinion.

I think it is not unfair to say that those polls are as good a reflection of public opinion as could be found, and that, by and large, taking a cross-section of the American people, regardless of party, the American people today, as they did in the days of 1918 and 1919, want to see the United States of America assume the moral clear-cut, unequivocal leadership of the world, they want the United States Senate to say to all mankind, to every Government on the earth, "Fear not, the United States this time will not forsake you when we have won the victory, the United States this time will not shirk its obligations to mankind, the United States of America, which has so gloriously won the war, will not ignominiously forfeit the peace."

Mr. President, a few moments ago I quoted from the work of Mr. Fleming the footnote on page 24, where it is stated that Senator Watson, of Indiana, told Senator Henry Cabot Lodge that the ministers of the United States were preaching in their pulpits for an effective world organization, the League of Nations; that

the church people all over America were advocating the League of Nations, and that they wanted it and prayed for it. What are the teachers, what are the preachers, what are the bishops, what are the rabbis, what is the clergy of America today saying about an effective international organization after the war?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is the Senator about to discuss the declarations made by these great faiths?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I am.

Mr. HATCH. That is important, and if the Senator will yield for the purpose I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|              |                 |               |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Andrews      | Gillette        | Pepper        |
| Bailey       | Guffey          | Radcliffe     |
| Ball         | Hatch           | Reed          |
| Bankhead     | Hawkes          | Revercomb     |
| Barkley      | Hayden          | Reynolds      |
| Bilbo        | Hill            | Robertson     |
| Brewster     | Holman          | Russell       |
| Bridges      | Johnson, Calif. | Scruggam      |
| Brooks       | Johnson, Colo.  | Shipstead     |
| Buck         | Kilgore         | Smith         |
| Burton       | Langer          | Stewart       |
| Bushfield    | Lodge           | Taft          |
| Butler       | Lucas           | Thomas, Idaho |
| Byrd         | McClellan       | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper       | McFarland       | Thomas, Utah  |
| Caraway      | McKellar        | Tunnell       |
| Chavez       | McNary          | Vandenberg    |
| Clark, Idaho | Maybank         | Van Nuys      |
| Connally     | Mead            | Wagner        |
| Danaher      | Millikin        | Walsh         |
| Davis        | Murdock         | Wheeler       |
| Downey       | Murray          | Wherry        |
| Eastland     | Nye             | White         |
| Ellender     | O'Daniel        | Wiley         |
| Ferguson     | O'Mahoney       | Willis        |
| George       | Overton         | Wilson        |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am confident that every Senator would like to know the solemn and deliberative opinion—let me add, the reverent sentiment—of 146 of the principal religious leaders of the United States, as embodied in a declaration made within the last month, entitled "Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant Declaration on World Peace," issued by representatives of the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths. Copies of the declaration may be obtained from the Church Peace Union and World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.

Mr. President, the program of the religious leaders of the United States is contained in seven points. They are brief and they are pertinent, and I shall read them to the Senate:

#### CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT DECLARATION ON WORLD PEACE

##### THE MORAL LAW MUST GOVERN WORLD ORDER

1. The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

#### THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL MUST BE ASSURED

2. The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

#### THE RIGHTS OF OPPRESSED, WEAK, OR COLONIAL PEOPLES MUST BE PROTECTED

3. The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

#### THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES MUST BE SECURED

4. National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

#### INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE WITH JUSTICE MUST BE ORGANIZED

5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

#### INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION MUST BE DEVELOPED

6. International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

#### A JUST SOCIAL ORDER WITHIN EACH STATE MUST BE ACHIEVED

7. Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

In a world troubled to despair by recurring war the Protestant churches have been seeking to show how moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations. Their conclusions are in many important respects similar to those of men of other faiths. In this we rejoice, for world order cannot be achieved without the cooperation of all men of good will. We appeal to our constituency to give heed to the foregoing proposals enunciated by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, which must find expression in national policies. Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian Gospel.

Rt. Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, New York City, president, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church.

Bishop William Y. Bell, Cordele, Ga., president, Board of Evangelism, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard, Cleveland, Ohio, moderator, General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches.

Rev. P. O. Bersell, Minneapolis, Minn., president, Lutheran Augustana Synod and National Lutheran Council.

Bishop A. R. Clippinger, Dayton, Ohio, president, Board of Administration of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ.

Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, New York City, moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Rev. Robert Cummins, Boston, Mass., general superintendent, Universalist Church.

Rev. Frederick May Elliot, Boston, Mass., president, American Unitarian Association.

Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp, Bethlehem, Pa., president, Provincial Elders' Conference of the Moravian Church.

Rev. L. W. Goebel, Chicago, president, General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Rev. C. E. Lemmon, Columbia, Mo., president, International Convention of the Disciples of Christ.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Boston, Mass., secretary, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Rev. W. W. Peters, McPherson, Kans., moderator, General Conference of the Church of the Brethren.

Rev. Jacob Prins, Grand Rapids, Mich., president, General Synod of the Reformed Church in America.

Rev. Donald W. Richardson, Richmond, Va., moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Rev. Joseph C. Robbins, Wollaston, Mass., president, Northern Baptist Convention.

Rev. Albert N. Rogers, Yonkers, N. Y., president, General Conference of the Seventh Day Baptist Churches.

Bishop John S. Stamm, Harrisburg, Pa., president, Board of Bishops of the Evangelical Church.

Allen U. Tomlinson, Whittier, Calif., presiding clerk of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends.

Bishop P. A. Wallace, Brooklyn, N. Y., senior bishop, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

Bishop James C. Baker, Los Angeles, Calif., chairman, International Missionary Council.

Frank S. Bayley, Seattle, Wash., president, National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations.

Rev. G. Pitt Beers, New York City, chairman, Christian Commission for Camp and Defense Communities.

Mrs. J. D. Bragg, St. Louis, Mo., president, Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Board of Missions.

Dr. Arlo A. Brown, Madison, N. J., chairman, International Council of Religious Education.

Rev. Rex S. Clements, Bryn Mawr, Pa., president, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rev. Charles E. Diehl, Memphis, Tenn., chairman, National Commission on Church Related Colleges.

Dr. John Foster Dulles, New York City, chairman, Federal Council's Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace.

Rev. Robert M. Hopkins, Indianapolis, Ind., president, United Christian Missionary Society.

Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.

Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford, Pa., chairman, American Friends Service Committee.

John T. Manson, New Haven, Conn., president, American Bible Society.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York City, chairman, Christian Conference on War and Peace.

Rev. William P. Merrill, New York City, president, the Church Peace Union.

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta, Ga., president, board of missions of the Methodist Church.

Dr. John R. Mott, New York City, honorary chairman, International Missionary Council.

Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, Albany, N. Y., president, American Council, World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.

Commissioner Edward J. Parker, New York City, national commander of the Salvation Army.

Mrs. Norman Vincent Peale, New York City, president, Home Missions Council of North America.

Rev. Daniel A. Poling, Philadelphia, president, International Society of Christian Endeavor.

Rev. Charles P. Proudft, Chicago, president, Council of Church Boards of Education.

Dr. Leland Rex Robinson, Bronxville, N. Y., president, American Committee for Christian Refugees.

Rev. Russell H. Stafford, Boston, Mass., president, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Charles P. Taft 2d, Cincinnati, Ohio, chairman, Friends of the World Council of Churches.

Rev. Henry P. Van Dusen, New York City, president, American Association of Theological Schools.

Rev. A. Livingston Warnshuis, Bronxville, N. Y., chairman, Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

Rev. Luther A. Weigle, New Haven, Conn., chairman, World's Sunday School Association.

Miss Amy Ogden Welcher, Hartford, Conn., president, United Council of Church Women.

Rev. Herbert L. Willett, Wilmette, Ill., president, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity.

Most Rev. Theophilus Pashkovsky, San Francisco, Calif., Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America.

Most Rev. Antony Bashir, Brooklyn, N. Y., Metropolitan of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church.

Rt. Rev. Bohdan, New York City, bishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America.

The American synagogue commends to the attention of its own constituency and to all men of faith the foregoing principles as a guide to thought and action in dealing with the grave world problems of our time. These seven principles, while they do not exhaust the teachings of the Jewish tradition on issues of social relationships, have their sanction in Judaism both Biblical and rabbinic. Judaism's highest goal has ever been "to amend the world through the kingdom of God." The synagogue therefore calls upon its adherents, both as citizens and as Jews, to seek after the implementation of these principles. They will thereby act in faithful conformity with the moral values of the Jewish religion, and at the same time serve the best interests of country and of mankind.

Dr. Israel Goldstein, New York City, president, Synagogue Council of America.

Dr. Louis Finkelstein, New York City, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Dr. Julian Morgenstern, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Hebrew Union College.

Rabbi Saul Silber, Chicago, Ill., president, Hebrew Theological College.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, New York City, president, Jewish Institute of Religion.

Rabbi William Drazin, Savannah, Ga., president, Rabbinical Council of America.

Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, Pittsburgh, Pa., president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.



Rabbi Louis M. Levitsky, Newark, N. J., president, Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, St. Louis, Mo., chairman, Commission on Justice and Peace of Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Joseph Zeitlin, New York City, chairman, Social Justice Commission of Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Louis J. Moss, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, United Synagogue of America.

Dr. Samuel Nirenstein, New York City, president, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations.

Adolph Rosenberg, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Mrs. Isidore Freedman, New York City, president, Women's Branch of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Mrs. Hugo Hartmann, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

Mrs. Samuel Spiegel, New York City, president, Women's League of United Synagogue of America.

Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, New York City.

Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Henry Cohen, Galveston, Tex.

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D. C.

Rabbi B. Benedict Glazer, Detroit, Mich.

Rabbi Samuel H. Goldenson, New York City.

Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein, New York City.

Rabbi Julius Gordon, University City, Mo.

Rabbi Simon Greenberg, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi James G. Heller, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rabbi Leo Jung, New York City.

Prof. Mordecai M. Kaplan, New York City.

Rabbi C. E. Hillel Kauvar, Denver, Colo.

Rabbi Jacob Kohn, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Isaac Landman, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi B. L. Levinthal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi Felix A. Levy, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Morris Goldstein, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, New York City.

Rabbi Edgar Magnin, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Abraham A. Neuman, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi David de Sola Pool, New York City.

Rabbi Irving F. Reichert, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Herman H. Rubenovitz, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Milton Steinberg, New York City.

Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, New York City.

We present for the consideration of all men of good will the foregoing postulates of a just peace as embodying the principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better social order.

Most Rev. Edward Mooney, archbishop of Detroit, chairman, administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Most Rev. Samuel Alphonsus Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, vice chairman, administrative board, N. C. W. C., chairman, bishops' committee on the Pope's peace points.

Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo, chairman, social action department, N. C. W. C., honorary president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Most Rev. Edwin Vincent Byrne, archbishop of Santa Fe.

Most Rev. John J. Cantwell, archbishop of Los Angeles.

Most Rev. Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington.

Most Rev. Edward D. Howard, archbishop of Portland, Oreg.

Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio.

Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, O. P., archbishop of Cincinnati.

Most Rev. John J. Mitty, archbishop of San Francisco.

Most Rev. Joseph F. Rummel, archbishop of New Orleans.

Most Rev. Constantine Bohachevsky, bishop of Ukrainian Greek Catholic diocese, Philadelphia.

Most Rev. John A. Duffy, bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.

Most Rev. John M. Gannon, bishop of Erie, Pa.

Most Rev. Richard O. Gerow, bishop of Natchez, Miss.

Most Rev. Charles Hubert Le Blond, bishop of St. Joseph, Mo.

Most Rev. Aloisius J. Muench, bishop of Fargo, N. D.

Most Rev. John F. Noll, bishop of Fort Wayne, Ind.

Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, bishop of Kansas City, Mo.

Most Rev. John B. Peterson, bishop of Manchester, N. H.

Most Rev. James H. Ryan, bishop of Omaha, Nebr.

Most Rev. Basil Takach, bishop (Greek Rite), diocese of Pittsburgh.

Most Rev. Emmet M. Walsh, bishop of Charleston, S. C.

Most Rev. Francis J. Haas, bishop-elect of Grand Rapids, Mich.

Rev. Edward A. Conway, S. J., Denver, Colo., Regis College.

Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., Baltimore, Md., St. Mary's Seminary.

Rev. Hugh A. Donohue, San Francisco, Calif.

Rev. Vincent C. Donovan, O. P., New York City.

Rev. Cyprian Emanuel, O. F. M., St. Louis, Mo., Franciscan Monastery.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand, Mundelein, Ill., rector, Mundelein Seminary.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George Johnson, Washington, D. C., director, department of education, N. C. W. C.

Rev. John La Farge, S. J., New York City, executive editor, America.

Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S. J., St. Louis, Mo., editor, The Queen's Work.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick J. McCormick, Washington, D. C., rector, Catholic University.

Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., Notre Dame, Ind., president, Notre Dame University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, Washington, D. C., director, social action department, N. C. W. C.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, Washington, D. C., Catholic University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Matthew Smith, Denver, Colo., editor, Denver Catholic Register.

Rev. Edward V. Stanford, O. S. A., Villanova, Pa., president, Villanova College.

Rev. Paul F. Tanner, Washington, D. C., director, youth department, N. C. W. C.

Mrs. Robert A. Angelo, York, Pa., president, National Council of Catholic Women.

Frederick P. Kenkel, St. Louis, Mo., director, central bureau, Catholic Central Verein.

Francis P. Matthews, Omaha, Nebr., supreme knight, Knights of Columbus.

Frances E. McMahon, Notre Dame, Ind., president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Charles P. O'Donnell, Washington, D. C., chairman, Post-War World Committee, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Wilbert J. O'Neill, Cleveland, Ohio, president, National Council of Catholic Men.

Harold A. Stevens, New York City, president, Catholic Interracial Council.

Mr. President, the fifth plank in that platform for peace is headed "International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized." I especially commend it to the proponents of the pending resolution; I commend its clear and certain language.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I understand that three leaders joined in issuing this joint statement. Incidentally, it is my understanding that it is the first time in the history of our country that some 150 leaders of the three great religious faiths have united in a statement on such a vital issue as this.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Minnesota is correct. Moreover, Mr. President, this is no instrument conceived upon the spur of the moment. This is no spontaneous declaration from the 146 leaders of the three great faiths. This is a document long deliberated upon, carefully framed, and scrupulously worded, and it represents the solemn reflection of the religious ministry and laity of the United States.

Mr. BALL. Does not the Senator think it is significant that these 150 leaders of the 3 great faiths were able to agree on an expression of principles so much more concrete, specific, and strong than the resolution the Senate now has before it?

Mr. PEPPER. It is most significant, I will say to the able Senator, and it shows that again, in the United States, public opinion has formed behind a purpose for peace through an effective international organization. The ministry is pleading with the Nation's Representatives to effectuate these minimum requirements of such an organization or institution.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Florida is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I understand that before the resolution was reported, three representatives of the three faiths requested an opportunity to be heard before the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee is in the Chamber. I do not know of my own personal knowledge whether such a request was addressed to the committee or not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will answer if the Senator wishes to have me do so.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me finish this statement. I know that this declaration was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and that it was stated that these representatives would like to be heard. It was resolved by the committee, these representatives would like to be heard, that there would be no further hearings on the pending resolution.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator wishes to have me respond, I will do so. I am not seeking to offer any explanation, because the facts do not require any.

After the full committee had resolved not to hold any further hearings because we wanted prompt action, we received a

request locally, by telegram—they did not even call us on the telephone or come to see us—from two religious personages who asked for an opportunity to be heard. I simply said that the committee had already declared that it did not wish to hold any further hearings, and therefore I was not at liberty to invite them to appear. But they were here in Washington. The telegrams emanated from Washington. We were considering the question for months. The subcommittee did not decline to hear any one who wished to be heard. We were trying to obtain prompt action. For months the Senator from Minnesota has threatened that if we did not report the resolution promptly he would move to discharge the committee and get action. Now we have it here and we cannot get action.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I enjoyed his discussion of these religious characters. I thought he was going to say that they approved the amendment. Does the Senator claim that in their resolutions these religious leaders approved the amendment which he is sponsoring?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I propose to show by comparison that the minimum requirements of the religious leaders whom I have just quoted go far beyond the resolution reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and are far more in accord with the amendment to be offered by the junior Senator from Florida and the group whose names appear upon the amendment, than with the resolution as reported from the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator now in his possession—I do not mean to suggest that he get it, because he will probably try to get it anyway—any resolution or letter from the three religious leaders to the effect that they want the particular amendment which he is to offer? The Senator knows whether he has or not. I do not know.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have no such letter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does any other member of the group have such a letter or resolution? They are not all present in the Chamber.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. According to the news account, the Senator from Texas telegraphed the three Representatives that the committee had already voted not to hold hearings, and suggested that they file statements. I happen to have a copy of the letter which Msgr. John A. Ryan, of Washington, the Catholic representative, sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Monsignor Ryan was kind enough, knowing of my interest in this subject, to send me a copy.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, if I may. I have been interrogated pretty sharply. Did these ministers request hearings before the subcommittee at the suggestion of any member of the group of Senators who are now active?

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator from Texas that they did not. They themselves wanted to be heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. They had a right to be heard if they had come in plenty of time. We were considering the question for months. The first suggestion which I received to the effect that they wanted to be heard was not from them, but from one of the group of Senators who thought that we ought to hear them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was the one who made the suggestion to the Senator from Texas. Is not that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator says he is, I presume he was.

Mr. HATCH. I do not know who else made the suggestion, but I do say to the Senator that I did make the suggestion that this group wanted to be heard, and that I thought the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations ought to hear the group. I made that suggestion, not because of any letter sent to me, but pursuant to a personal conversation with at least one representative of these great groups. I was informed that they wished to be heard. It was a voluntary suggestion from him to me. I had not promoted it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. If the committee of ministers wanted to get in contact with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and they went to the Senator from New Mexico, I think they went to the wrong place.

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the Senator from Texas that they did not come to me as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, seeking to be heard. It developed in private conversation that these men wanted to be heard. I did not think that I was stepping outside the bounds of propriety as a United States Senator when I imparted that information to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. If I was wrong in that, I apologize to the distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been dragged into this discussion. There is no occasion for the Senator from New Mexico to be offended.

Mr. HATCH. I am not offended.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no reason for him to apologize to the Foreign Relations Committee. He does not owe me an apology, and does not owe the committee an apology. The committee is willing to hear anyone any time; but we have been prodded and harassed. It has been said that we must have speed. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] had made dire threats on the floor of the Senate and in the press as to what he would do to the committee if we did not report a resolution. He was going to have the Senate discharge the committee. Senators have said, "We demand action. We must have action." Then when we try to give them action, they want to delay consideration by further hearings and more debate. Now they

want to delay the debate. There is difficulty in obtaining a quorum.

That is my answer, Mr. President.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas that we finally got action, and I am very happy about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; the Senator got action which he did not want, and because he got it he is sore, and mad, and is trying to smear and emasculate the resolution and tell the rest of the world that it is not any good, and does not amount to anything—helping us a good deal with foreign nations, and in the war effort.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is not trying to emasculate the resolution, and the Senator from Texas very well knows it. The Senator from Minnesota merely seeks to put back into the resolution the principles which the Senator from Texas himself has espoused publicly on the floor of the Senate and in a speech at Houston, Tex., last summer.

If the Senator from Florida will yield to me further, I should like to say that I believe the Senate will be interested in a letter which Monsignor Ryan sent to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in response to an invitation. The religious groups were not heard by the committee, and I am not trying to blame the committee for it. I think, however, that the Senate is entitled to know their views on the pending resolution. The letter is dated October 22, 1943, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: By way of supplementing the memorandum on the principles for a just peace issued by the three religious bodies, which you were kind enough to invite me to send to your committee, I am submitting a brief comparison between point five of the religious leaders' statement with the final paragraph of the resolution reported out yesterday by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I shall make my observations under two heads: First, nature of the international agency to be established; second, the proposed functions of the international agency.

I

The statement of the religious bodies calls for the organization of "international institutions." The comparable expression in the Foreign Relations Committee statement is "international authority." "International institutions" is comprehensive and concrete; "international authority" is comprehensive but is neither concrete nor unambiguous. Of course, it would be improved by prefixing the article "an." Nevertheless, "authority" has too many meanings, one of which is "the power derived from opinion, respect, office, mental superiority, or the like." For example, we speak of the authority of Aristotle or of Thomas Jefferson. The Kellogg-Briand pacts which outlawed war enjoyed for a short time considerable "authority" and aroused great and widespread hopes as an instrument for preserving peace, and they were international in scope. Where are they now and what has become of their "authority"?

II

The proposed functions of these respective declarations. The statement issued by the religious bodies proposes that the international institutions set up "will develop a body of international law, guarantee the fulfill-



ment of international obligations, drastically limit and control armaments, provide for the compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies and employ adequate sanctions." The first four of these proposals are not even mentioned in the statement of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The fifth finds general expression in the last clause of the committee version. However, the word "power" is less concrete and definite than the phrase "adequate sanctions" which occurs in the last phrase of the religious statement. "Adequate sanctions" obviously comprises both military and economic forces. "Power" might be construed as meaning merely moral power, such as the Kellogg-Briand Pacts possessed but which proved utterly inadequate. Indeed, it is as unprecise and fluid as "authority." On the other hand, "adequate sanctions" can mean nothing less than economic or military forces, or both.

Not the least of the merits of the religious bodies' statement is its omission of the question-begging, irrelevant, and confusing word, "sovereignty." In the welter of recent discussion, this term functions all too frequently as an horrendous fetish or an empty shibboleth.

I remain, my dear Senator, with great respect,

Very sincerely yours,

Rt. Rev. Msgr. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

I thank the Senator from Florida for the time which he has allowed me.

Mr. PEPPER. I make the observation, for the attention of the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the Senator from Minnesota has just quoted a letter from Msgr. John A. Ryan, of Washington, D. C., director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, one of the signers of the Catholic group declaration in the Pattern for Peace from which I have just read. One of the signers of the Pattern for Peace declaration, in addressing himself to the chairman of the committee, says that the committee's resolution does not meet the minimum requirements set out in this declaration of the ministry of the three principal faiths of this Nation.

A short while ago the able Senator asked the Senator from Minnesota, as well as other Senators, whether we had any communication from the religious groups from whom I have just read, approving our amendment. I think it would be only fair for me to make inquiry of the able chairman as to whether he has from those religious groups any communication approving the resolution of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am frank to say that we have not, and we have not received any communication approving the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I have not undertaken to make any capital out of the situation. It is the Senator from Florida who is quoting the pronouncements of the clerical gentlemen, as though that gave some verity or some standing to his amendment. They did not mention his amendment at all. They did not mention our resolution, except incidentally to say that the word "power" is not clear, and so forth and so on. But that does not in reverse prove that they are in favor of and are supporting

the amendment of the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Florida and others have changed and modified their resolution and amendment several times. But the pending resolution is the one I am speaking about at the present time. The clerical gentlemen do not say they are supporting the amendment of the Senator from Florida; do they?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, they do not say they are supporting our amendment, but they lay down principles which are not embodied in the Connally resolution, and which are embodied in our amendment. That is the significant thing, and that is the thing which I am afraid our distinguished chairman has overlooked.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the distinguished chairman has overlooked it because it is not so.

Mr. PEPPER. I suppose, then, that the able chairman disagrees with the interpretation of Monsignor Ryan.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not disagree with someone who is not here; I disagree with the Senator from Florida, who is here, looking me in the eye. I say his interpretation is not correct. Is that plain? Does the Senator understand that?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, but does the Senator understand that I say to him exactly the same that he says to me, and with equal affirmation, and with equal strength, and with just as little qualification? Does the able Senator understand that?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; I understand it.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not want the Senator possibly to misunderstand me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the question has arisen as to whether or not the statement of these great religious groups endorses or approves any particular resolution. The fact that someone does not happen to have a letter approving our particular resolution or some other resolution has seemed to be of some importance. It is of no importance to me whether these groups have endorsed the pending resolution or not. The important thing is the principle which has been laid down by these religious groups.

It is the principle for which they stood, and on which for the first time in the history of this country they got together, and which they declared that is important, and I think, Mr. President, that it is important also that the principle endorsed by men representing, as I understand, some 16,000,000 citizens of this country in their respective States, be well considered by the Senate of the United

States or by a committee or by any other body, for if any group in all this world has labored long and earnestly in the cause of peace, it is the religious group. As a reason why consideration should be given to such a declaration, I wish to read now from a letter written by Mr. William Agar to the New York Times under date of October 10 this year, commenting on this very statement:

These are minimum requirements—

Referring to the declaration—

which all men of good will can do their utmost to implement.

I agree with the statement that all men of good will, including every Member of the Senate, should do their best to implement that declaration.

The religious leaders of the country have fulfilled their duty. They have indicated the way to unite in a common effort to attain a just and peaceful world order.

We have heard a good deal on the floor of the United States Senate about uniting. I do not know any better way to unite than upon such immortal principles as are promulgated in this declaration.

But the practical steps—

The religious leaders have performed their duty—

But the practical steps required to implement their proposals must be taken by our politicians and statesmen.

Mr. President, we in the United States Senate today are charged with the responsibility of implementing this great declaration, and that, in a small measure, is what some of us are trying to do.

We do not fulfill our responsibilities as citizens in this matter merely by acquiescing to these proposals in our own minds. We must point out their importance to others and do our utmost to make our legislators follow the directives they give.

Those are not my words; I am reading from a letter published in the New York Times of October 10 this year.

For these moral principles will not save the world unless the men to whom we grant the power to frame the institutions and construct the machinery for the peace are guided by them.

I wish the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who stand on this floor and say that not one jot, not one tittle of this resolution shall be amended or changed but that it must be taken exactly as they have handed it down to us, would listen to these words, for it is our duty to construct the machinery for peace and to be guided by these immortal principles.

On the other hand, the best institutions and the most perfect machinery men can devise will fail without the wholehearted support of the vast majority of men. Our duty as citizens is, therefore, twofold. We must first urge and then support it with all the energy and good will we possess. If we fail this time, we will have nobody to blame but ourselves.

The Washington Post of October 7 said in an editorial:

The manifesto—

And I am still referring to the one the Senator from Florida has just placed in the RECORD—

is certainly an historic document. Its significance lies less in its actual content or in the position it takes concerning various problems of reconstruction than in the evidence it gives that leaders of the three great religious faiths are now willing openly to work together for the achievement of important objectives.

The Post editorial continues:

The most striking parts of the document, however, are its insistence on "adequate sanctions" to enforce when necessary the arbitration of international disputes, and on international economic collaboration, and the very strong position it takes against "the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states . . ." It goes far beyond any declaration of post-war policy made thus far by any of the now warring powers.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all the comments I have here, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, various excerpts and editorials in full.

There being no objection, the excerpts and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek of October 11, 1943]

Clear, forthright, and brief, the document was designed as a minimum set of principles for practical cooperation among nations, not as a full program. More important to churchmen was the fact that the three faiths had been able to agree in every detail of the extremely precise and concrete statement . . . the goal of this declaration, like other religious peace pronouncements, is to influence public opinion enough to force the diplomats to take heed.

[From New York Times of October 20, 1943]

These are minimum requirements which all men of good will can do their utmost to implement. The religious leaders of the country have fulfilled their duty. They have indicated the way to unite in a common effort to attain a just and peaceful world order. But the practical steps required to implement their proposals must be taken by our politicians and statesmen. We do not fulfill our responsibilities as citizens in this matter merely by acquiescing to these proposals in our own minds. We must point out their importance to others and do our utmost to make our legislators follow the directives they give.

For these moral principles will not save the world unless the men to whom we grant the power to frame the institutions and construct the machinery for peace are guided by them. On the other hand, the best institutions and the most perfect machinery men can devise will fail without the wholehearted support of the vast majority of men. Our duty as citizens is therefore twofold. We must first urge and then support it with all the energy and good will we possess. If we fail this time we will have nobody to blame but ourselves.

[From Catholic Action of the South of October 14, 1943]

We believe that this action should have a profound influence on the peace discussions and postwar planning. Beyond doubt, it serves as a warning as to what the basis of a just and lasting peace, resting on moral principles must be, as viewed by religious leaders,

who are the best qualified to point this out. The statement crystallizes the opinion of the religious leadership of the country, hence represents moral views that must bear weight with those who will have in their hands the tremendous task of planning world peace.

In our opinion these points dare not be overlooked or nullified, because of their very essential nature in the establishment of a lasting peace. One need but glance over the seven points to realize that they cover the major ills of humanity, and they offer the remedies for elimination of those injustices and fallacies that have caused so many woes and consequent wars. If they are ignored or nullified, we shall have before us only the clouds of future wars on the horizon.

[From the Washington Post of October 7, 1943]

The manifesto . . . is certainly an historic document. Its significance lies less in its actual content or in the position it takes concerning various problems of reconstruction than in the evidence it gives that leaders of the three great religious faiths are now willing openly to work together for the achievement of important objectives.

The most striking parts of the document, however, are its insistence on adequate sanctions to enforce when necessary the arbitration of international disputes on an international economic collaboration, and the very strong position it takes against the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states . . . It goes far beyond any declaration of postwar policy made thus far by any of the now warring powers.

[From America of October 9, 1943]

The declaration announces to our statesmen and economists and businessmen, as well as to the great masses of the people, certain elementary truths of natural justice in their application to the complex problem of an international world order. These truths belong to Christian teaching. They are not the whole of that teaching, nor its loftiest heritage. They are simply the indispensable minimum of that moral law which, in the language of Pope Pius XII, "the Creator Himself manifested in a natural order, and which He has engraved with indelible characters on the hearts of men . . ."

The proclamation of these truths places upon all men a grave responsibility for their fulfillment. This responsibility rests most heavily upon those who by reason of their position and influence can most easily see these aims effected. But it rests in a proportionate measure upon all men, and to Catholics above all falls the duty of providing the spiritual leadership in the moral combat for a just world. The seven points are not compiled merely to be dreamed over. Our responsibility will not have been fulfilled until we have, through study, fully grasped their meaning for ourselves, spread the knowledge of them, and seen that our elected representatives follow their direction when they apply themselves to working out the concrete problems of peace.

[From the Christian Century of October 13, 1943]

It needs to be borne in mind that this declaration represents the minimum demands of America's churches and synagogues as to the nature of the peace. As the preamble adopted by the Catholic signers in presenting the document to Roman Catholics states, the seven "postulates . . . express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men."

One other characteristic of this document gives it a peculiar authority. Although it has been written and signed by these religious leaders acting as individuals, behind every one of its seven points there stand declarations which carry maximum weight with the members of all three religious communities. The digest of "supporting documents" prepared by the Federal Council of Churches (and doubtless to be obtained from that body) makes this authoritative undergirding clear. Thus, every item in the declaration is given standing among Catholics by deliverances of Pope Pius XII. For Jews there are the supporting affirmations of the Synagogue Council, the Rabbinical Assembly, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and similar acknowledged sources of Jewish teaching. And for Protestants, every position is reinforced by the findings of the Oxford and Delaware conferences, as well as of numerous denominational conventions.

In the first place, as has been indicated already, it marks the formation of a true united front by the religious forces of this country to bring to bear their influence on the nature of the peace. As such, it marks a new stage in religious cooperation—a stage far advanced beyond any attained in the past. . . . That united front will in itself constitute a major influence for the making of a just, generous, and hopeful order—an influence tragically missing from pre-war society.

But now the churches and synagogues have lined up solidly behind a conception of world organization and order which utterly repudiates both the practice and the spirit of isolationism and acknowledges full responsibility for American participation in a whole network of international institutions. Neither the isolationism of withdrawal nor the isolationism of empire can find sanction in this pronouncement of the Nation's united religious forces.

Finally, the appearance of this declaration constitutes notice served on political leadership that it must submit its acts in making the peace to the review and judgment of church and synagogue as interpreters of the moral law. There have been distressing signs of late of a tendency in political quarters to drift back toward secret manipulations in that tradition of power politics out of which has come so much of the agony of the past. With Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leadership uniting on such a platform as this declaration lays down, political leaders who may be tempted to return to the moral nihilism of balance-of-power diplomacy and military-alliance statecraft must reckon with a condemnation not to be lightly provoked. Not only in Washington, but in London and in Moscow and in Chungking, the publication of this common agreement by American religious bodies as to the requirements of a just peace will from this moment constitute a tremendous fact which statesmanship must take into account.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of October 10, 1943]

To the American people, first, and to the peoples of all the embattled world, this news, which press and radio properly places among the vital announcements of military and political and economic and diplomatic happenings, and declarations of purposes and policies, will come as a great uplift of morale. It is both a revelation of the innermost purpose of the war and of the purpose which must be recognized in the winning of true peace to follow the war. . . .

Great as the domestic effect of the joint declaration undoubtedly must be classed, its world importance transcends even its vast national import. For it places beneath the



platform of the world policies of the United Nations, in a practical fashion, basic and indestructible principles, instead of the shifting and temporary devices of material and conflicting political, racial, economic, and military interests and expediencies to which our diplomats, and other secular leaders, have so vainly resorted since long before the First World War.

[From the New York Post of October 11, 1943]

Absolutely essential to the creation of a real peace, which must mean a peace which resolves differences, instead of hardening and perpetuating them, are principles acceptable to large bodies of men in all countries, including those of our enemies. The pacification of the world, after this war, is a missionary task. Statesmanship can be used as its instrument. But the spirit cannot be created out of nationalism and national interests, for nationalism, raised to the point where it has usurped all values and laid hold on the throne of God, is the basic cause of this war.

Therefore it is essential that a voice come out of the darkness to speak for the human race, and for principles untainted by national interests. That this voice should come from men of three creeds, who mutually seek to serve God and man, is altogether fitting and is the correct answer to Hitler.

[From the Boston Traveler of October 9, 1943]

A common call without precedent in world history has been issued by the three great religious faiths of America. In an hour of world crisis, leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish churches have issued a joint testament of faith in the rights of man and the dignity of the human spirit.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 7, 1943]

The importance of the church's militant leadership in winning the peace cannot be minimized. It is one of the vital forces which influence men's thoughts and actions and, united as the three great faiths now are, they can be a potent force in arousing the people of this country to the support of a realistic program to achieve the objectives they have set out as the moral basis for an enduring peace.

[From the Commonweal, New York, N. Y., of October 15, 1943]

The joint statement of October 7 is an important step toward winning the coming peace. Each of its seven points is backed up by more detailed enunciations of principle, such as papal allocutions, resolutions adopted by the Rabbinical Assembly and Protestant denominational and interdenominational statements. If these principles are unflinchingly insisted on by American adherents of the major religious bodies, there will, indeed, be some chance of winning the peace. This is interfaith activity at its utmost value.

[From the Catholic Courier of Rochester, N. Y.]

Extreme significance must be attached to the identical statement on peace issued simultaneously by members of the hierarchy and Protestant and Jewish religious authorities. Agreement by religious leaders on what constitutes basic principles for permanent peace will be of no little concern to industrial labor and political leaders as well as to legislators and those who direct foreign policy. . . .

To all who respect the role that religion should play in formulating plans for peace, the statement presents a basic frame of ref-

erence for the several specific plans and programs being brought to the fore.

The statement will bear fruit only in attaining specific application by those responsible for formulating post-war programs. Ultimately its effectiveness will rest upon a widespread popular acceptance and insistence.

[From the Church World, Portland, Maine, of October 8, 1943]

The real significance of the declaration of world peace, recently sponsored by nationally known representatives of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism would seem to lie in the fact that for the first time in our national history there is a concerted effort to read religion into the peace program which is now being formulated by the United Nations.

[From the Catholic Sentinel, Portland, Oreg., of October 14, 1943]

It is of interest to note that the program in six of its seven points makes allusion or direct mention of international organization as a necessary medium in the post-war era for the establishment and maintenance of peace. . . . The seven-point program is full of constructive thought, no matter how hard it may be to realize in full. And having the endorsement of representative Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, it should have a strong influence upon forthcoming legislation on the subject of peace.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in this connection, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me once more, I hand to him another strong statement by the joint commission on reconstruction adopted by the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2 of this year. I am going to ask the Senator from Florida if he would not like to read it in connection with his remarks at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the declaration handed me by the able Senator from New Mexico, being the report of the joint commission on reconstruction adopted by the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2-11, 1943, reads as follows:

In the light of this faith we seek a more unified world, possessing a world framework within which the nations may find security and freedom, and within which in peace the nations set themselves to cooperate for production and distribution.

The bitter experience of the past quarter of a century has underscored the basic Christian principle of the unity and mutual responsibility of all mankind in God. "We are members one of another; if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it. God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth." Practically, we believe the idea that the balancing of power with power would create a harmony of economic and political powers has broken down; "the freedom of the nations is today dependent on achieving a supranational unity in which each nation actively participates and which has the power to protect it against insecurity and conquest"; this will not be achieved by *laissez faire* but by ending the present international anarchy through the creation of an international authority.

According to the testimony yesterday on this floor by a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which reported the pending reso-

lution, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], "international authority" are the exact words which were deleted from the resolution reported by the subcommittee. Senators will recall that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] said that the original draft of the Senate committee resolution provided for "an international authority," and that that language was deleted. It must be assumed, from such an able body of men, that it was purposefully deleted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Iowa is not present, and I ask, Is it not a fact that all he said was that the article "an" was eliminated?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator just quoted "an international authority," and then said that that language was deleted. The only deletion was of the article "an," still retaining the word "authority," which the Senator has denounced here.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is an element of correctness in what the able chairman of the committee has said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the Senator say how far that element extends.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says "an element of correctness." I was either correct or not correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator wants to be captious about it, he was not correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas wants other Senators to respect his integrity and his sincerity, that is all he wants. The Senator from Texas was either correct or he was not, and when the Senator—

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator was not wholly correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator from Florida says that the Senator's statement has an element of correctness in it, he is insulting.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator wants to construe what I said as an offense, I regret it, but I cannot prevent it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator can be accurate, and say what he means.

Mr. PEPPER. I propose to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, say it, then.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I meant to say that there was an element of error in what I had said. The matter might as well be mentioned now as at any other time. I will say that in any discussion of this subject which the junior Senator from Florida makes, to the best of his limited ability, he will present to the Senate only that which possesses merit; but it has been rather apparent to the Senate how the able chairman of the committee, for 2 days now, has felt. First, when he had answered questions not more than 15 minutes yesterday, he advised the Senate, in a moment of noticeable impatience, that the debate had degenerated into a heckling; and he was the chairman of the committee, who should have been the authentic voice telling his fellow Senators what this



resolution meant. Had he not been questioned, he would not have taken up a single word of it. His prepared address speaks for itself. He has been impatient with debate. He did not desire debate, Mr. President, and now every time a remark is made here the Senator seems to take it as a personal affront.

I certainly have nothing but the highest respect and the greatest esteem for the able Senator from Texas. If I have unintentionally given him offense, I humbly apologize. But if I make a careless or improper use of a word, I do not like to have the able Senator not give me an opportunity to correct it without making a spectacle of an offense upon the floor of the Senate. I hope that nothing I shall say or give inference to will in any way offend any Senator, least of all the able chairman of this committee.

A few moments ago, in addressing the Senator from Minnesota, who had said nothing to give the able Senator from Texas offense, the able Senator in his way, into which he sometimes lapses, certainly questioned the good faith of the able Senator from Minnesota, and certainly said things to him, as the Record will attest, accusing him of obstruction and other things, at which the able Senator from Minnesota might, if he had been a little less broad-minded and sympathetic and understanding, have justly taken some offense.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Texas must remember that Senators have their sentiments, all Senators, including the able Senator from Texas, and they do not like to be browbeaten, either, and, if they are able to prevent it, they do not expect to be browbeaten by their colleagues, certainly by those for whom they have the warmest and the friendliest feelings.

Mr. President, I pause to apologize for any remark I may have made. I shall explain why I said "an element of correctness," by which I intended to correct my own inaccuracy. What I had uppermost in my mind was that the resolution of the committee does not say "an international authority," it says "international authority." I was reading from a resolution of a religious group, which used the words "an international authority." The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] in the presence of Senators on this floor—and I am not speaking in the absence of subcommittee members; I see several of them on the floor at the present time—stated yesterday that at one time the language of the resolution contained the words "an international authority." Our amendment says "an international organization." That is what we are contending for. We contend that that is different from "international authority." In our amendment the article "an" appears. So I lapsed into the error of saying there had been stricken out of the subcommittee draft the very thing this resolution speaks of "an international authority" and that "international authority" had been inserted. If I erred in saying they struck out "an international authority," I meant that they deleted the words, that they took "an international authority" out, and left only

"international authority." When the Senator called my attention to the fact that all they actually deleted was "an," I meant to say, certainly with no offense, that there was an element of correctness in that.

I perhaps should have been more careful in choosing my words. But I am right, and I assume no Senator will question what a member of the subcommittee said here yesterday, that whereas this resolution says, "This will not be achieved by laissez faire but by ending the present international anarchy through the creation of an international authority based on law, and provided with power to enforce that law," at least the words "an international authority," all together, or the institution which would be an international authority, is not provided for in the resolution of the committee.

Certainly the article "an," which we think essential and vital—an organization something like the League of Nations, if you please—an organization which is an entity, something which is distinct from its membership, is not created in the resolution of the subcommittee. This is what they say, and the pertinent paragraph is the third:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority.

Not "an international organization," not "an international authority," but "international authority." This group of religious people say that if anarchy is to be avoided, that must be achieved through the creation of "an international authority," and I will say right now to the able Senator, the chairman of the committee, in charge of the resolution, that if he will substitute "an international authority" for "international authority," or if he will cause the article "an" to be placed in front of the word "international," I am confident that our group, which has offered an amendment seeking to establish "an international organization," will acquiesce, and delete that part of our amendment.

Mr. President, we think that is the very heart of the matter. We do not think the resolution of the subcommittee was intended to create an international organization or an international authority. We think that by studied ambiguity they have avoided that, lest they might have committed themselves with some certainty and positiveness to a particular principle or policy. It was not the intention of the committee, Mr. President, to face the Senate and say, "Yes, before the world we advocate and advise that the United States become a party to an international organization or authority to be constituted of the nations of the earth, which shall have an entity, an existence, in international affairs."

No; they preferred a resolution which will allow those who favor the League of Nations to say, "Yes, that is what we are getting. Look at the resolution. We are getting an international authority. Surely that is what is meant in the resolution."

On the other hand, the committee, by its resolution, makes it equally possible for those who so bitterly oppose an international organization of the league character to say, "Well, after all, what the committee is thinking about is some kind of cooperation among nations, a getting together into some kind of a working together and getting together from time to time."

Mr. President, that poses the essential heart of the question presented by our amendment. Our amendment may not be right. Our amendment may not be what the Senate should adopt. Our amendment, if it be adopted, may disappoint its authors. It might not stave off the horrors and the tragedy of World War No. 3, the shadows of which are cast in the Senate today. No, Mr. President, it might not gratify the hope of mankind that children yet to be born shall not die in blood and mud, but before God and fellow Senators I say it is something definite at least, and the committee resolution, like an old Mother Hubbard, covers everything and touches nothing.

Mr. President, I will resume the reading of the declaration of the Joint Commission on Reconstruction, which was adopted by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church held at Cleveland from the 2d to the 11th of October.

We need to arm ourselves now with the moral purpose to fashion such a united world beyond the day of battle.

We would, therefore, advocate the following propositions:

1. The coming peace must provide an overall arrangement for international collaboration in dealing with those common world problems which are capable of no purely national or regional solution: within such world framework purely regional affairs can be left to regional groups.

Mr. President, I propose later to discuss the details of the committee resolution, but show me in its language anything that proposes affirmative collaboration among nations. Show me anything equivalent to what appears in our amendment, which gives as the first and essential purpose of this international organization which we propose to create the purpose "to promote cooperation among nations."

On the other hand, when we read the resolution reported by the committee we find it says nothing about meeting economic problems. It says nothing about promoting cooperation among nations. It says nothing about an affirmative function of this international authority which is to be set up. It will be found in the last analysis that it is a sterile proposal to establish brute force as the policeman for the world. That is essentially what the resolution proposes. It proposes the creation of a policeman who shall have power to prevent aggression, and to preserve peace, and that is all the power he is given, unless it means that this organization can do anything anywhere at any time which it may propose to do, which is a blanket authority which no Senator would propose seriously to his colleagues to be granted to any kind of an organization or authority.

2. Such collaboration should include the supervision and control of all military estab-



ishments and the creation of international police power sufficient to set up an effective system of collective security, yet with machinery flexible enough to allow for adjustment of equitable changes and claims. The world has now become one: whatever happens anywhere in the long run happens to all: the world must therefore be organized accordingly.

3. Such collaboration must be able to deal with the broad world problems of finance and economics.

Mr. President, I read the resolution. Besides the first two catch-alls or whereases, which mean nothing, the third and pertinent paragraph reads as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, is there anything in that paragraph about economics, about promoting the welfare of the world by economic collaboration? Is there anything in it about finance? Is there anything in it about currency stabilization? Is there anything in it about relief and rehabilitation? Is there anything in it about disarmament? No, Mr. President, there is merely the sheer grant of power to enforce a military stringency upon the assertion of aggression, and with some general and meaningless commission to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if we are to understand that the three religious organizations to which he has referred have endorsed such a plan as the Senator has just outlined?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to my able friend from Nebraska that I was reading from a report made by the Joint Commission on Reconstruction, adopted by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2 to 11, 1943.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. I wish to ask the able Senator from Florida if the three religious organizations mentioned by him have endorsed the so-called Ball-Burton-Hatch resolution, or the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and other Senators, or both.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the honesty of the inquiry of the able Senator from Nebraska, and as best I can I will say that the summary of the situation is as follows: A little while ago, within the last few weeks, this group of leaders of the ministry of these three faiths—the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish—after a long deliberation and consideration, promulgated this declaration of theirs which they call A Pattern for Peace. One of the signers of that declaration in the Catholic faith was Monsignor Ryan. The able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] read a letter addressed to the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] from Monsignor Ryan, pointing out the deficiencies

in the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Resolution 192, as compared to the declaration of the three religious groups. So far as I know, Monsignor Ryan in the letter did not say that he approved the amendment which we propose, but he emphasized the deficiencies of the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 192, and it is our position, I will say to my good friend from Nebraska, that taking the language of the three religious groups in their manifesto, which they said was the minimum for an effective world organization, greater agreement and accord will be found with the amendment offered by our group than with the resolution now pending reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that explanation.

Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the Senator's opinion that the three distinguished men who represent the three faiths were speaking for the churches or were voicing the opinion of the churches they represent, as to their attitude toward the principles laid down in the declaration of principles?

Mr. PEPPER. That is my opinion. I cannot say that they actually had authority to represent the churches.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking.

Mr. PEPPER. But I can say that I believe those eminent men—approximately 50 from each of the faiths mentioned—represent the sentiment of the leadership of the ministry of those three denominations.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I was about to read, "such collaboration must be able to deal with the particular world problems of financial interest, the regulation of tariffs with an eye to the interest of the community of nations as a whole, and the establishment of free access to raw materials."

Is there anything in the resolution now before the Senate which would give the international authority it would create the slightest jurisdiction to interest itself in problems growing out of world tariffs? Is there in the resolution any suggestion which by any possible stretch of the imagination would give the international authority proposed by the committee, the jurisdiction of which is "to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," any authority to deal with the question of access to raw materials, which is one of the very proximate causes of the present conflict? I submit that in the pending resolution providing for the establishment of this international policeman with a gun and a club, Mr. President, which is the only possible interpretation of the language "international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," there is nothing which by any possible stretch of the imagination can give any authority for their international authority to deal in such an affirmative way with those problems and functions which alone may resolve the economic crisis and conflict among nations.

The able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has just handed to me a telegram delivered to him, dated at New York, October 25, 1943, and addressed to him. It reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., October 25, 1943.

CARL A. HATCH,

United States Senator,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

In the name of the organized religious bodies of American citizens of Jewish faith we urge you reject all resolutions failing to conform to minimum requirements for peaceful world set forth in Protestant, Catholic, Jewish resolution of world peace, namely, international guarantee human rights all races and creeds, establishment international law, guarantee fulfillment international obligations, insure collective security by limiting and permanent control of armaments, compulsory arbitration of controversies with use of adequate sanctions. Vital you support every amendment which clarifies these essentials and admits no ambiguity.

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA,

DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, President.

Mr. President, that telegram was sent on the 25th of October. It was sent in reference to the pending debate in the Senate. While it does not mention the amendment of the group with which I have the honor to be identified, at the same time it is clear on the face of the telegram that it contemplates the ambiguity, the inadequacy, and the weakness of Resolution No. 192, which is now the principal resolution pending before the Senate; and I will say, Mr. President, that that is exactly the purpose of the group with which I am associated. We are not wedded to our amendment. If anyone has anything better, I believe every member of our group, some of whom are now on the floor, will support such an amendment. We are talking about the difference in principle between a meaningless and a meaningful declaration by the Senate of the United States as to the policy of the United States of America.

Mr. President, there is no misapprehension in any one's mind about what has happened here. The able Senator a minute ago was speaking about delay. I wish, however, to finish reading the declaration before I comment about that. I desire to reiterate, for myself, that I am told the able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has an amendment, which I assume he has sent to the desk, relating to the restoration of world trade after the war. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall support that amendment. I believe the members of the group with which I am associated will support it, too, because the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi is an able, clarifying, and strengthening amendment.

I read again from the report of the joint commission on reconstruction of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

4. The nucleus of such international authority is already in existence in the United Nations.

Mr. President, does the resolution of the committee say anything about the



United Nations? Not a word. With whom does it say we should join in the establishment—not of “an” or of “this”—but “of international authority”? It says “with free and sovereign nations,” but that leaves out of membership every noble people now overrun by tyranny and the terror of Hitler and his Axis co-partners. At least this Protestant Episcopal group realizes, as we did when we offered the amendment, that it is with the United Nations that we are fighting the war, and it should be with the United Nations, at least as a nucleus, that we should make the peace. That, Mr. President, has been totally ignored by those who wrote Senate Resolution 192.

What a difference in the sentiment and the spirit of the opponents in this matter. We will gladly yield to any betterment of our amendment. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would likewise do so. We will gladly yield to any better or any more clarifying amendment.

But what does the committee tell us? No; they would not even allow their colleagues on the full committee to amend the resolution in a single detail. The subcommittee is in fact but the instrumentality of the full committee. Since March of last year they have had a commission from their principal, the full committee, to write a resolution on this subject, and we all have a right to our individual opinion as to whether anything save the pressure of the country and of the House of Representatives in the passage of the Fulbright resolution ever would have brought to the floor of the Senate any kind of resolution from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. We have a right to exercise our own judgment and to entertain our own opinion as to whether it was desired, even by the responsible leadership of that committee, to bring out anything on the floor of the Senate, upon the announced fear that to precipitate discussion, perhaps even in the full committee, certainly on the floor of the Senate, would be dangerous to our allies' impression of us—dangerous, Mr. President, to our international standing and responsibility.

So I say that even in the full committee, when a subcommittee which had had this subject since last March, only on Tuesday of last week seriously began to consider this subject, it was understood that not an “i” was to be dotted and not a “t” crossed, save as fixed by the subcommittee.

Now the resolution has come to the floor. Ordinarily Senators do not profess to be wedded to a word. Surely one is open to the charge of presumptuousness if he thinks his language, however long it may have been deliberated upon, cannot possibly be improved in the Senate, with the scrutiny of 130,000,000 people turned upon it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In line with what the Senator is now saying, it has been suggested directly that we must not amend this resolution, because to attempt to do so on the floor of the Senate would be

to write a resolution which would be dangerous. That suggestion has been made not once, but many times.

I will ask the able Senator, who is a member of the committee, if everything for which we contend here on the floor was not fully presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and if it had wanted to consider the amendments, it could have done so without running into any danger of writing a resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. I will go further. I recite only facts. Woodrow Wilson once said, “Nothing is to be gained by leaving this essential thing unsaid.” Since this question has been opened up, it might as well be said that when the four Senators—the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]—came before the committee there was a distinct impression that they came there as a matter of sufferance; not only that, but before they were invited to make their statement practically all the members of the subcommittee, in their presence, were called upon by the chairman and given an opportunity to state their views about the report and the resolution of the subcommittee. I can imagine how intimidating—whether consciously or unconsciously done—it was to those four brethren of the Senate, sitting there mouse-like in the corner, to hear the members of the subcommittee, called upon by the chairman to do so, express and reiterate their conviction with respect to the resolution which they had reported, before any opportunity was given for discussion of it by them or by the full committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the Senator's statement, I think it ought to be stated to the Senate and to the country that one of the first things the subcommittee did after being appointed by the chairman, by direction of the whole committee, to consider all these resolutions, was to invite the four Senators who had sponsored the resolution to which the Senator is now referring to appear before the subcommittee. They accepted the invitation, appeared, and were fully heard. They all made their statements to the subcommittee.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. They made no further request to appear before the subcommittee; but in their statements before the subcommittee at that time they emphasized the fact that they were not wedded even to their own language, but hoped that the subcommittee could draft a resolution which would be practical and could be adopted.

After the subcommittee had spent weeks, and even months, working upon the resolution, it authorized a report by the subcommittee to the full committee. The full committee did not get that report until the meeting to which the Senator is now referring; and in the presence of the full committee and the mem-

bers of the subcommittee, the chairman of the subcommittee made his report to the full committee, and members of the subcommittee were called upon to make any statements they desired to make in regard to the processes by which the subcommittee had arrived at its conclusions. There was no effort on the part of any member of the committee to intimidate the four Senators. They did not come there on sufferance. They came there because the committee thought they had a right to come. They were Members of the Senate. They were welcome, and they were heard with pleasure, I will say to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There is one thing which the Senator from Kentucky has said which perhaps should be explained more fully.

The Senator from Kentucky said that soon after our resolution was submitted we appeared before the subcommittee at the invitation of the subcommittee. I think that is entirely correct. I do not think we went into the question fully at that meeting. Back in March many things were being considered which were not considered in October. One of the chief things was the contention that we ought not to say anything. We took the position that our resolution was not the last word. We had always taken that position, and we take it now, with respect to the amendment which we offer. If it can be improved, we will gladly accept the improvement.

The point I rose to make is this: On that day last March when we appeared before the subcommittee I left with the definite impression—I do not say that anyone told us so, because my recollection is not good—that before the subcommittee reported the resolution we would again meet together. I made no request to be heard further. I do not charge anyone with bad faith. I do not charge anyone with misrepresentation. I merely make that explanation as to why we did not ask further hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not criticizing any of the four Senators for not making a request for a further hearing. If they had made it, or if we had had any information that they wanted to come before the subcommittee further, I am satisfied that they would have been accorded that privilege.

What I rose to do was to dissipate the idea which the Senator from Florida is seeking to impress upon the Senate, that the Senators who had submitted the so-called B2-H2 resolution were invited before the committee and appeared as a quartet of orphans, at the sufferance of the subcommittee. That certainly is not true.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say in response to that statement that, being one of the four Senators who appeared, I did not feel exactly like an orphan. I do not



think we were intimidated, but I was grievously disappointed at the result.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a perfectly legitimate feeling on the part of the Senator, and it is one to which we are all accustomed. During our legislative experience we are frequently grievously disappointed. I was grievously disappointed the other day, and have been grievously disappointed on other occasions at the action of the Senate with respect to things on which I had my heart set; but that is an entirely different thing from being intimidated, or seeking to intimidate any one.

Mr. HATCH. The disappointment was not because the language of our resolution was not adopted. It was in part because we did not think the resolution adopted by the subcommittee and by the full committee was full enough, as we have argued, and as we shall continue to argue. I was particularly disappointed in the attitude of the full committee, and I am disappointed in the attitude on the floor of the Senate, that not one single word can be changed, that this work of the subcommittee is final, conclusive, and binding, not only on the full committee, but on every Member of the Senate, and that we are doing something tremendously wrong when we exercise the privilege of a United States Senator and suggest one simple amendment. I am terribly and grievously disappointed at that attitude.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad that my warm friend the distinguished majority leader gives me an opportunity to correct any impression I may have left that I intended to state that there had been any intentional intimidation of the four Senators named. I meant to say that I felt that the fact that they were invited before the committee, and that before they were permitted to be heard, the members, or most of the members, of the subcommittee were interrogated or allowed to make a statement, of necessity had a somewhat disquieting and disturbing effect—at least a cooling impression—upon the Senators waiting there to present their affirmative amendment to the members of the full committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I must say it was not too warm.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has conveyed, better than I could, the warmth of the hospitality which the group met on that day.

I wish to confirm what the able Senator from New Mexico has suggested, namely, that after the able Senators left, four members of the committee offered the exact resolution which we have given notice that we intend to offer on the floor of the Senate, with a change in only one respect. I believe we had left out the word "other" before "United Nations." On Tuesday we did not have any provision for the inclusion of additional nations besides the United Nations. We debated the matter for only a few minutes before the committee adjourned. Our

next meeting was on Thursday. On Thursday our amendment was presented to and formally voted upon by the full Committee on Foreign Relations, exactly in the form in which it now appears, with the exception of one word. We did not have the word "other" before "United Nations," as we have now; but except in that respect, the amendment was exactly as it is today in print upon the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, what I was saying was that in Cleveland, in early October, the Joint Commission on Reconstruction of the Protestant Episcopal Church stated as follows:

The nucleus of such International Authority is already in existence in the United Nations, born out of sheer necessity. We urge that now, while the fire of war is still hot, and interests and aims more easily welded, there be created a central Council of the United Nations "as an organ for cooperative action" in prosecuting the war and in preparing for and organizing the peace. The United Nations must remain a permanent body, ultimately reaching out toward universality by the inclusion of neutral and enemy states.

Mr. President, is there anything like that language in the resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Resolution 192? Does the resolution say anything about the United Nations being the nucleus, that it must be a permanent organization, that to it in due course must be added neutral and enemy states? Mr. President, what does our amendment say? I ask Senators to attend its language:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with—

Not "free and sovereign nations," which may mean anybody, but would not mean the members of the United Nations who are under the heel of Hitler—the other United Nations.

Join in peace with those with whom we fight in war. There are some 30 of them, Mr. President, now solemnly bound together, fighting together around the world. Are they not good enough to be confederates in the organization of peace?

Mr. President, in the Foreign Relations Committee we were assisted and aided by the suggestion of the members that in our first amendment we had made provision for the inclusion of the United Nations only, and had not provided for the inclusion of other member states. We gladly and proudly acknowledged our error, and endeavored to correct it before the committee as well as on the floor of the Senate.

I read from the amendment which we have before the Senate—

Join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted.

That is what we say. That is what the Protestant Episcopal convention in Cleveland had in mind in saying—

The United Nations must remain a permanent body, ultimately reaching out toward universality by the inclusion of neutral and enemy states.

And further—

5. Any chance to create a stable world will depend primarily on the willingness of the United States to renounce isolation and to play its full part and assume its full responsibility and exercise leadership—

In what?—

In such an International Authority.

Not "in such an International State," but "in such an International Authority."

The same "an", Mr. President, that the subcommittee deliberately deleted in the consideration of the resolution before they reported it to the full committee.

So I think it is only proper to say—and a little later I shall discuss in more detail the resolution of the religious groups—that surely, for whatever weight the Protestant Episcopal Reconstruction Commission may have, they are, throughout the land, more in accord with our amendment than they are with the resolution of the full committee.

Mr. President, there is one other statement which I should like to read. It is a paragraph of a declaration of the American Federation of Labor. It is taken from the report of the proceedings of the American Federation of Labor, and is dated at Boston, October 13, 1943:

We hope that Congress will declare our basic foreign policy without unnecessary delay. Such a declaration is necessary to enable our foreign representatives and the executive branch to develop plans and negotiate agreements. We believe that world organization to keep the peace must begin with understandings between the governments of the democratic nations, and extended as rapidly as possible to other nations which manifest their desires in good faith to cooperate for the objectives served by democratic institutions. The right to representation of labor and other functional citizen groups must be provided in all world agencies. Such right is a condition essential to the protection against bureaucracy.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Florida has just read a statement of the position of a great labor organization. I wonder if I may presume on his time long enough to read a letter which I received this morning from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, one of the great farm organizations.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It gives me pleasure to read the letter. It is dated October 25, 1943, and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR BALL: As the Senate debate on American participation in post-war world affairs approaches, I desire to recall the position of the National Farmers Union to you and other Senators who have joined with you in attempting to strengthen the so-called Connally resolution.

This position was set forth in the National Farmers Union program for 1943 adopted by delegates in convention at Oklahoma City on November 19, 1942. Under the heading, "No return to isolationism," the program contains the following statements:

"(8) Full participation in the councils of the nations, to the end that we may live in abundance in a world that is governed by

law based on justice. This means that we cannot return to isolationism, but must participate in world affairs to protect the way of life we are determined to achieve.

"(9) Insistence upon world trade policies that will give all peoples everywhere the chance to earn a decent living. Trade barriers lead to wars. In this war trade is a weapon used by the Government for the best interests of the United States and the United Nations. When peace comes we must continue to exchange our surpluses with those of other nations without the intervention of international profiteers. Groups adversely affected must be provided with economic and technical assistance to bring about a sound adjustment."

In the first of these two statements of principle, the word "full" is important. The National Farmers Union, when it adopted that statement, meant unequivocally that it desired the United States to participate as completely as practicable in the organization of the world for a just and lasting peace.

The Connally resolution, as it is now drawn, is not sufficiently clear and definite on this point to justify its support by the National Farmers Union. Therefore, the union will support any amendment of the Connally resolution that will embody, however it is worded, the statement of principle quoted above.

The second of these principles, No. 9 in our program statement, is, it seems to us, of at least equal importance.

I should like to express through you the hope that the Senate in its debate on post-war forms of cooperation will not ignore the necessity of grappling with the economic problems, the solution of which is the real key to a real peace. I think you will agree with us that whatever organization finally is agreed upon will be but an empty shell unless it is based on a fair economic deal for the oppressed and exploited groups of the world. In other words, unless the peace is a democratic peace from an economic point of view, then it will be but another uneasy truce between wars.

Please feel free to use this letter in any way you wish.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES G. PATTON,  
President, National Farmers Union.

If I may presume further, I think Mr. Patton makes it very clear that the great democratic farm organization of which he is the head wants a stronger, clearer statement of the American position on post-war foreign policy than is contained in the pending resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota for his valuable contribution to the subject.

Mr. President, what I intended to say was that the fact this resolution has been brought out at all, that this subject is now being considered by the United States Senate, is due to the clamor, the demand, and the insistence of the people of the United States, and, I believe I may say, of the men in uniform and of the women in uniform of this Nation, that the United States Senate shall assure all mankind that it will not again, after they, the soldiers, have won the war, betray its obligation to them and make the United States again a defaulter before the world.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that clamor for an expression by the Senate of the United States is due

to the fact that after the last war the United States led the world in a policy of economic isolation which largely contributed toward the present conflict, and that they want an expression from us that that will not be the conduct of this body in the world reorganization which will follow this war?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct; and I shall discuss now, Mr. President, why it is that the people want a declaration of policy and principle from the Senate before it is too late. If it had not been that the subject came up for debate and discussion the people back home, save for the impression they might have gained from our attitude previous to Pearl Harbor, which might be presumed or might not be presumed to have carried over to the present—I say, Mr. President, save for that presumption—the people might indulge or the inference or the deduction they might draw they would not have known how their Senators felt about saving the peace and the victory won by their sons.

Mr. President, I am one of those who run next year for reelection; one-third of the United States Senate will go before the American people next year for reelection. The people are entitled to know from a searching examination they can give our records how much we are willing to fight and, if necessary, to sacrifice in order to keep World War No. 3 from engulfing the children the older brothers left home when they went away to this war. If the Senate does not enunciate a clear-cut, unequivocal, positive, meaningful declaration which will have the weight and the dignity and integrity that a declaration of this body formally made should have, all in the world the people of this country can do, all that the returning soldiery can do, all that our allies can do is to hope and pray that the United States shall not become derelict again to its solemn obligation to mankind.

So, Mr. President, this time the American people do not wish to be crucified upon the altar of political ambition again; this time, Mr. President, the American soldiery and the American people, and perhaps even our allies, do not propose to be victims of American senatorial caprice. If there be those who would obstruct a sane world order, common decency demands that the full truth be disclosed to an interested people. Yet if the Senate adopts a resolution which means everything and nothing, it will be little less than purposely dishonest with the American people.

We have already, according to newspaper reports, the greatest diversity of opinion as to the construction of the resolution among members of the committee. In the absence of the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I am most reluctant to quote anything they said, but if I am not in error—and if I am I stand corrected by the truth as it may be—I read in the Washington newspapers that the able Senator from Georgia said that he would not favor an international police force, and, if I am not in error, I heard the

able Senator from Maine, a member of the subcommittee, this morning say that, in his impression and by his construction, Senate Resolution 192 as reported by his subcommittee and committee authorized and allowed for an international police force.

Mr. President, I have understood that the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] who, within his right completely, has differed in international policy with some of us, including the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], has not changed his attitude or opinions, and proposes to vote for the resolution reported by the Senate committee, if the newspapers be correct and my memory be exact, because it means nothing.

Mr. President, the able Senator from North Dakota perhaps does not believe as I do in international collaboration in the setting up of an international organization, in affirmative cooperation among nations, in an international court with power to decide international controversies peacefully and if need be the use of military force to keep world peace; but is it fair for the able Senator from North Dakota—I refer to him only by way of illustration—to go before his constituents in North Dakota and say, "I do not agree to all these things, because I voted for the Connally resolution, Senate Resolution 192," meaning by that that he has not changed his views about what some of us please to call isolation—whether I am right or not in that appellation—and then have the junior Senator from Florida go before his people in Florida and say, "You know that I believe in international cooperation, and I attest that I have evidenced my belief by reference to Senate Resolution 192"? Mr. President, I ask all my associates in the Senate whether that is political integrity.

Some Senators say the resolution may be interpreted even to include the League of Nations. Is the able Senator from North Dakota going home to his people and say, "I voted for a League of Nations"? Are the members of the subcommittee going home and say, "I voted for a League of Nations"? Are other Senators going home and say, "I did not vote for a League of Nations; there is nothing in the resolution about a League of Nations."

Some, including the able Senator from Michigan, say it includes a provision for a world court. Mr. President, is the able Senator from North Dakota going home and say, "I voted for a world court"? He could hold this resolution up before any audience of literate men and women in his State and say, "See for yourselves whether I supported a world court." Yet the able Senator from Michigan, presumably, whenever he reports to his people, is going to say, "I voted for a world court."

Mr. President, yesterday I asked the question whether the Senate had not twice repudiated or failed to ratify the World Court. I said two Presidents had recommended to this body adherence to the World Court by the United States.



I was in error; four Presidents had recommended it to the United States Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator now want to convey to the Senate of the United States and to the people of the United States the idea that he and his associates have performed the miracle of stating something in such language that there cannot be two or more different constructions placed upon it?

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; I do not. By the language of the third provision of our amendment, if that is what the Senator has in mind, where we speak of "power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," we have purposely left open the question as to whether that power, including military force, should be the military forces of the several constituent states, or whether it should be a force that should be under the direct command of the international organization. I will say to the able Senator that if there is a deficiency in our amendment, we do not claim to be more than human, but we have thought that our amendment has less ambiguity than the resolution of the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator mean to say today that, in the great campaign which will follow next year, Senators differing in their views on this great proposition will not, under the language of the Senator's amendment, be able to go before different constituencies and place varying constructions on it as they can on Senate Resolution 192?

Mr. PEPPER. I would say that I believe there is not so much ambiguity in our amendment as there is in Resolution 192. Perhaps I may be in error, but that is our opinion.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would expect the Senator to say that, and to defend the language of his amendment, as he so eloquently is defending it. But I call his attention to the fact that there probably is nothing written in the English language in more cogent, more concise, and more direct terms, than the Constitution of the United States; yet a day never passes that we do not find people of equal authority putting different constructions on it.

This morning, as well as yesterday, we had before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary some of the ablest lawyers of the United States, contending that the Constitution means one thing. Next Tuesday we will have lawyers of equal ability saying that it means something else. So that when a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and takes the language of Resolution 192 and says that the Senator from North Dakota will construe it one way and that he will construe it another way without taking a

position on either Resolution 192 or the amendment offered to it by the able Senator from Florida I predict that, even if the immaculate language used in the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida shall be adopted by the Senate, he can look for many different constructions before Members of the Senate and the people of the United States generally get through construing it.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator is undoubtedly correct in what he says. Yet, let it be remembered that our amendment was offered as a clarifying and a strengthening amendment to Senate Resolution 192. It does not purport to make it perfect, but it does purport to make it clearer than it is in its present form. Now let me indicate the respect in which that may be said to be done. In the first place, we believe that the United Nations—

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator coming to a further explanation of his remark as to why he did not clarify the military provision of his amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall discuss that later, but I will say, in continuation of what I was stating, that we believe that the United Nations should be the nucleus group. We have said that in our amendment, "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the United Nations." We are willing—and we believe they should be included—to include such other nations or free and sovereign states as may be invited to come in, either in the establishment of this organization, or in the maintenance of it after it is established, and we have said that by the language "and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted."

Mr. President, we believe that what should be created is an international organization. That is not a term or phrase that is exclusive of all but one meaning, but it is clear that an international organization is more analogous to something like the League of Nations than it is to some pact like the Congress of Vienna, for example, or some association of nations which does not create a new entity on the earth, and because we are leaning in the direction of the creation of an entity, namely, an international organization, we have eliminated some of the ambiguity which would be found in the use of the words "international authority."

In addition to that we have said, "with authority to settle international disputes peacefully." We believe there should be a world court, or something like a world court. We believe that there should be some kind of an international judicial power and authority, that there should be an international judicial institution. That is what Elihu Root said long ago, that is what William Howard Taft said, I believe, that is what other jurists of the United States have taken the leadership in from time to time; that is, the establishment of an international judicial authority to settle, in a juridical way, by the principles of international law and comity, international conflicts as they may arise.

Four times a world court has been proposed to the Senate, by three Republican Presidents and one Democratic President, but the Senate has never done more than to ratify it one time, with reservations not agreed to by more than five member nations. We feel that it would be taxing the credulity of the reading public too far to ask them to believe that the United States Senate, by adopting a resolution which said "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," by the use of that language, upon the background of its own history, intended to authorize, as the able Senator from Michigan said, the establishment of a world court.

Mr. President, we who favor a world court, we who believe that it is necessary to preserve the world peace, we who believe that the time has come when international conflicts can no longer be settled in the arena of force, we who believe that civilization has progressed to the point where surely civilized men can live rather than by the rule of the jungle—

The simple plan that they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can.

We, believing that we must create new social institutions to take the place of war, contend that it is only right and proper that the Senate of the United States, in clear and unequivocal language, shall say to the world, "We will not again, as we have done four times in the past, be heedless of the recommendations of the President of the United States that we adhere to a world court."

If we who want a world court are not entitled to claim that the insertion of that language has clarified our intention, then I am sadly in error in reading and in understanding the effect of the language.

Mr. President, to proceed to the point made by my able friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], we have said that the international organization we propose to create shall not only have authority to settle international disputes peacefully, but it shall have power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. There is not any ambiguity in our language as to whether we are willing to resort to force or not. Perhaps the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is correct in his interpretation that the language of Senate Resolution 192 authorizes the use of military force, but at least may there not be a reasonable difference of opinion about it? Suppose there are two Senators on the floor. Suppose one of them thinks that we should have no force behind this international authority except economic sanctions; suppose another Senator thinks that if necessary we should resort to military force in carrying out the decrees of this organization; is it not just to give those two equally conscientious Senators a



fair choice? We have left no ambiguity in our amendment. We say "with power." It may mean economic sanctions. That may be enough. I think generally that perhaps would be enough. But there may come a solemn time, Mr. President, when nations shall have to determine whether they are willing to spill the blood of their people to maintain law, or whether they are willing to let anarchy go upon such a rampage that it shall bathe the whole earth in blood.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to understand whether the Senator's amendment is broad enough to advise a treaty which might come back to us with enough scope in it on the one hand to provide for an international army containing American troops which would be committed to war without consent of Congress, or on the other hand to provide for military force including American troops that, we will say, would be improvised from time to time, with the consent of Congress? Is the amendment that broad?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I would not under any circumstances say that. I would want to make important qualifications in that statement. I will be glad to tell the Senator what they are. For example, article X of the League of Nations contained two paragraphs. The first paragraph made it the obligation of member states to protect the territorial integrity and independence of all the member states of the League, as the able Senator well recalls. The second paragraph provided that in case of aggression it should be the duty of the Council of the League to convene the member states and to make such recommendations or to give such advice as should be proper in the opinion of the Council to meet effectively this aggression.

Not even President Wilson ever contended, to my knowledge, and so far as I know no advocate of the League ever contended, that there was any power in a treaty to make it obligatory upon the United States to consider itself in a state of war without the action of the two Houses of the Congress in the passage of a joint resolution signed by the President, as the Constitution of the United States requires.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then does the able Senator from Florida say that the language of his amendment completely excludes all possibility of the use of United States soldiers in the military forces of this particular organization referred to in the amendment, without the consent of Congress?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I would not say that. I want to be completely candid with the able Senator. I would not say that it would not be within the power. The able Senator will understand that this is only a charter of authority, as it might be said. It would under our amendment, if I properly interpret it, be within the power of the

member states of the organization we propose to create, for them, for example, to assign of their own accord a certain number of airplanes, a certain number of pilots, a certain number of mechanics, to become part of an international air force which might become subject immediately—of course, only by the sufferance of the power to whom they owed allegiance—to the instrumentality of the international organization to suppress military aggression. But, Mr. President, when it comes to throwing the full strength of the Nation into resistance to aggression, that is analogous to war, which only the Congress, of course, can declare.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am quite sure the Senator will appreciate that even an act of that kind, such employment of airplanes, even of limited scope, might be a perfect *casus belli* which would lead automatically into war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in anything we do we run the risk, of course, of war, but I believe it is the consensus of the country, and I hope of the Senate, that we have so long been the victim of the risk we have taken by not trying to preserve the peace, that we are now justified in undertaking certain even greater risks in trying to preserve the peace and promote the prosperity of the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, as I understand, the Senator does comprehend the immediate use of a small amount of force including our troops for, let us say, police purposes, by the direction of some international organization, without the consent of Congress, so far as our troops are concerned?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator says "without the consent of Congress." I would not put it that way for this reason: Our air force, of course—we will use air force by way of illustration—

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; I understand.

Mr. PEPPER. Our air force can exist only by Congressional appropriation.

The officers of the air force can have their being only by senatorial confirmation. The President of the United States can carry on a military organization only by the actual consent of the Congress. What I mean to say is that it would be within the power of our Government, under this charter of authority, if it chose to do so, and if it were agreeable to the Congress, in the sense that Congress made available and did not revoke such authority, to allow a portion of our air force to be used as a part of an international air force, for example.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to yield again?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield further.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, the language of the amendment is broad enough to advise a treaty which might come back to us with enough scope in it so that American troops, assuming we ratified the treaty, could be committed to war without the consent of Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. Not committed, I will say, to war, but, Mr. President, would be just like a police force that breaks up a

mob and is used for the suppression of military aggression.

For example, the movement by Hitler into the Rhineland may not constitute an action which necessarily should cause a war, just as we do not declare war when we impose economic sanctions. But the language of the amendment would permit the exercise of sufficient force to overcome the threat to world security, Mr. President, provided always that our Government acquiesced in it, and provided, of course, provision were made for it in a treaty which we ratified.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will ask whether there is a distinction in the distinguished Senator's mind between a little war, or what we might call in the usual sense of the word police duties, and a big war.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, that there is a distinction in my mind. Every great stream was at one time a spring or a trickle from the mountainside, or an emergence from the bowels of the earth. If one were able to cope with it and control it in its small stages one might be relieved of the necessity of meeting a roaring angry flood further down the stream of time and history.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to point out to me the language in his amendment which would prevent the President from bringing back to us a treaty which would authorize some international organization to involve us in war without the consent or concurrence of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the first place, Congress may be presumed to do its duty. In the second place, I do not consider that the Congress has constitutional authority to delegate to some other body the power to declare war for the United States. When the marines take action to protect property I do not regard that as declaring war, and the Congress does not regard that as declaring war. That is the distinction in respect to the expression "aggression."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am drawing a distinction in my own mind between routine police work and war, and I was endeavoring to direct attention for my own benefit to the distinctions in the Senator's mind.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it seems to me that on the question of where the power should reside—whether in the individual nations which are members of the authority or organization or in the authority or organization—neither our amendment nor the pending resolution—Senate Resolution 192—makes that question clear. I think it would be a perfectly plausible interpretation of Senate Resolution 192, as it reads, to say that it would authorize the President to negotiate a treaty creating international authority with power, including military force, to suppress aggression.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator refer to something beyond the mere exercise of small police power?



Mr. BALL. I think that is all anyone has ever actually contemplated in the way of international force—probably primarily air units to police the disarmament of the Axis, to put out the little fires before they grow into world wars. I do not think in our amendment we go into that question any more than the resolution as reported from the committee goes into it. I think either interpretation would be possible of either one.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, of course that is a very important question, and I am rather surprised that there is that much leeway in respect to the intent of the amendment, because it has the defect which the Senator has complained of in the resolution, namely, that there are too many alternatives.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say to my able friend that I wonder if he would not acquit us of quite as much ambiguity in our amendment as there is in Senate Resolution 192, because we do say, in the first place, "including military force." We do not leave any doubt about that. There are cases in which we would countenance the use of military force. But we do something else; we make it clear that we would use that power, including military force, only to suppress military aggression. We do not leave it open, as Senate Resolution 192 leaves it open, and say "to prevent aggression."

The suggestion was just made to me by one of our able colleagues that it would have been perfectly proper to have used the analogy of the break in the dike or the dam being stopped up before the whole structure collapses. We all remember the story of the hero who put his arm into the break in the dike and thus saved a city and its people from devastation.

What we are thinking about is that there is the authority in the power we prescribe in the amendment for the group of nations which come together in this international organization to provide for the use of even military force. No doubt we were influenced in bringing it up by the suggestion made by Mr. Churchill who stated in his speech, which the Senator will recall, that the force might be of two types; it might either belong to the international organization—I am only paraphrasing the Prime Minister's words—or it might reside in the several constituent members, and be subject to levy. In other words, it is the difference between the Army of the United States, which is the instrumentality of that entity, the present United States of America, and the army which was under the command of General Washington, an army which was raised, not by law of the Congress, but by levy upon the member States engaged in the Revolution.

We should like to leave that open, so that experience and wisdom, as it may evolve, may determine the answer.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. To my mind the Senator has left open perhaps the most vital question with which we should concern ourselves. So far as I am concerned, I

might consent to a limited police power, limited in objectives, carefully defined, to be called into action under certain conditions, whereas I never would consent to any sort of organization which would allow anyone to commit the United States to war without the consent of Congress. In the resolution, that is open.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I would not subscribe to any agreement or power which would give any organization, other than the Congress of the United States, according to the Constitution, the power to declare war on behalf of the United States of America. However, I am sure my able friend, if he has doubt about that meaning of our amendment, must be even more troubled about the purport of Resolution 192, for it says "with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, what would have that power to prevent aggression? International authority. Senators have been saying that it might include the League of Nations, that they contemplate something like an association of nations, a compact, or something of the sort—at any rate, that the international authority which they propose, or that that international authority which they propose, would have "power to prevent aggression." They did not say that the several member states shall have the power to come together and furnish forces which might prevent aggression. They did not say that. They said the international authority that they propose to create would have the "power to prevent aggression."

Mr. President, do they mean to prevent aggression by sanctions only? Do they mean to prevent aggression by military force? If they mean to prevent aggression by military force, then they evidently give the same leeway about which the Senator from Colorado is disturbed in respect to our amendment, except I think the Senator would have to admit that they give more leeway than we do.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me ask the Senator whether in the use of the word "military," he has not inserted a word of unnecessary limitations. The word "military," as I understand it, is used in various senses: One, as distinguished from the Navy; and then, of course, sometimes it is used in referring to the armed forces generally.

What interpretation would prevail? Certainly, the word "military" is very frequently interpreted as being distinguished from the word "naval"; and it is quite possible that this language might be construed so that the restricted interpretation would be applied when a test were made.

If one goes into the matter of the etymology of the word—which, of course, is not controlling, but merely is suggestive, since it is a bit of a guide in pointing out the use of the root word in the past—one finds, of course, that the word

"military" comes from the Latin word "miles" and refers to a foot soldier. Certainly it had nothing to do with naval operations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Maryland that the purpose in the use of that word was rather purposely to limit the language of the committee so as to show that when we conferred power upon this international authority it was not unlimited power to prevent any kind of aggression, but that we limited it to military aggression; the aggression which the international authority would have the power to prevent would be military aggression.

However, to proceed by considering the matter in another way, we would give not only economic power but military power to prevent military aggression.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But the Senator uses the phrase "military force."

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senator wants to provide for the use of force, what would be the advantage in restricting such use merely to the use of land forces, and not including the use of the naval and air forces?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the word "military" was intended in the larger sense of the term, to apply to any of the armed forces which a nation might possess.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But that interpretation is not always put upon it. The Senator has used a word which is susceptible of various interpretations.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct. Looking at it in one way, the word "military" might include only land forces and not naval forces. It might be best to say "including armed forces." I am sure that the group sponsoring the amendment would be indebted to the Senator if he should propose to clarify that language.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not offer the suggestion by way of criticism; but I make it because it seems to me that the Senator was using a word which had various interpretations and various meanings, always a source of danger to be avoided if possible.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct. We wished to make it clear that the power which the international authority would possess would be something more than economic sanctions, something more than persuasion, something more than mere civil force. We thought we were clarifying the language of the committee by making it clear that there was no intention to withhold the authority and power to use force which we may call armed force.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is undoubtedly aware of the fact that there are some precedents in which the Senate has advised, and on the strength of the advice, treaties have been concluded which have not been returned to the Senate for consent. I notice that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has an amendment which is brief. If the



Senator will permit me to do so I should like to read it.

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The amendment reads as follows:

That any agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such agreement shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

In the view of the Senator, does his resolution contemplate that whatever might result from it should come back to the Senate for consent?

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly. The Senate must regard itself as morally bound by its advice. Of course, it has no legal power to prevent a subsequent Senate from going contrary to the advice given, and, of course, the present Senate has no power to dispense with the constitutional requirement that treaties must be ratified before they become the obligation of the Nation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was pointing out that there are precedents for the advice—perhaps rather particularized in those cases, and perhaps more particularized than either of the two proposals before us—being taken as the equivalent of consent, and the treaties therefore did not come back to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there can be no treaty binding the United States unless it be consented to by the United States Senate, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring in the ratification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree 100 percent with what the Senator has said, but there are precedents to the contrary.

Mr. PEPPER. I dare say that if the precedents exist, if they were carefully examined they would be found to be governmental acts which did not necessarily come in the category of treaties; or perhaps the question was not raised. In other words, the Senate cannot, by mere acquiescence, make an obligation a treaty obligation. It may allow the executive department of the Government to carry out an agreement which it may have made, and if the question is never raised, it may be regarded as the obligation of this country; but it cannot become a treaty, as the able Senator has said, without being ratified in the proper way by the United States Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator be good enough to yield while I read three rather short paragraphs on that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I read from the Digest of International Law, by Hackworth, volume V, on page 58. The first excerpt which I wish to read is as follows:

The regular procedure is for the President to send the signed treaty which he desires to ratify to the Senate and for the Senate, if it is willing to give its advice and consent to ratification, to pass a resolution to that effect. Occasionally the Senate has passed resolutions in advance of signature authorizing the President to enter into a treaty as particularly described in the resolution. An exam-

ple of this latter procedure occurred when the conventions signed between the United States and Mexico on August 16, 1927, and August 17, 1929, extending the duration of the claims commissions provided for in earlier conventions were authorized by the Senate prior to adjournment and the authorization was acted upon by the President during the recess of the Senate.

The Department of State to Mrs. C. M. Keleham, June 25, 1931, MS. Department of State, file 026 Treaties/731.

I skip some matters which depart into other subjects, and come again to the subject which I have been discussing. I quote from page 59:

Since, therefore \* \* \* the initiation of treaty negotiation, the negotiation of its terms, the framing of its provisions, its signature, and the final act of ratification are performed only by the President and without any control by the Senate, all resting entirely in his discretion, it seems clear that the Senatorial "advice and consent" may be given to a general treaty plan and that the President conforming to such plan in his negotiation of a treaty, such treaty may be legally proclaimed by him without the necessity of putting the signed document before the Senate for its final consideration.

Memorandum of the Solicitor for the Department of State (Clark), Aug. 5, 1911. 1911 Solicitor's Opinions, part 2, pages 22, 228, 232, 245-246, 248.

This conclusion as to the lack of necessity for a second reference seems to have been acted upon in at least three cases; first, with reference to a secret article negotiated with the Creek Indians in 1790, in which case the Senate approved the substance of the article before it was signed by the parties, and there is no record that after its signature it was resubmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent before it was proclaimed by the President.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator infer from the case mentioned that the instrument to which the Senate gave assent was in being at the time it gave the assent?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it could be inferred either way. I think it could have been on advice which was sufficiently particularized so that the President felt safe in making a treaty which would follow the advice, let us say, almost word for word, without resubmission; or it might have been a generalized advice followed by a treaty which was not submitted for consent.

Continuing:

Another instance of the same kind is found in connection with the negotiation of an additional article to a treaty with the Cherokee Indians in 1792. The President having laid the basis of the additional article before the Senate, the Senate advised and consented thereto, whereupon the President, through his agent, negotiated the additional article which was proclaimed before ever being resubmitted to the Senate. The additional article in this case was negotiated and signed as a separate and distinct instrument from the treaty itself. The third precedent is to be found in the additional article negotiated to the Jay Treaty of 1794. In that case the Senate ratified the original treaty "on condition that there be added to the said treaty an article, whereby it shall be agreed, etc." The said article was negotiated and signed. After full consideration by the

President and Cabinet of the question as to whether or not it was necessary, after negotiation of this article, to resubmit the same to the Senate for its further advice and consent, it was decided that such resubmission was not necessary, and the treaty was accordingly proclaimed, including additional article without resubmission.

I thank the Senator for graciously yielding to me so that I could get that matter into the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. That is a valuable contribution to the literature on the subject. It is a very interesting subject. I propose to go into it in further detail tomorrow.

I would not, of course, say that it is impossible for the Senate to particularize its consent before the Executive acts, so that the Senate may fairly be said to have advised and consented to what the Executive, who is a partner in the treaty-making power, may have done. I would say that it is a matter of fair interpretation as to whether or not what the Senate has done may fairly be construed as indicating its advice and consent to the action taken by a two-thirds majority if it may have particularized before the act itself as to what was to be done, sufficiently so that a person might fairly say that the Senate advised and consented to it. I think that would be legal; but we were thinking more or less of a broad statement of principle, not pointed to a focus or related to an instrument with respect to which it could be fairly said that the Senate had actually advised and consented to that instrument.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as the Senator is concerned, and so far as his associates in sponsoring the amendment are concerned, are they willing to agree to the so-called Willis amendment, or its equivalent?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think it is necessary, I will say to my able friend, because the provisions of the Constitution, of course, are assumed to be a part of everything we do and say. The Constitution is very clear that what is done in respect to the making of a treaty must have the advice and consent of the Senate, with two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. I think such a provision in the amendment would be surplusage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The merit of the Senator's case as he has explained it is that he is particularizing through his amendment. The decisions which I have read put up a red lantern against particularization to the point where further submission to the Senate is not necessary. Therefore it seems to be only common prudence that the Senator's amendment, or the resolution itself, should have a distinct provision attached to it that a resulting treaty shall come back to the Senate for its traditional approval.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not entertain the fear which my able



friend from Colorado entertains, that anyone could or would construe the language either of the amendment or the resolution to be definite and particular enough to bind the Senate, as having advised and consented to it, if it did no more than pass a resolution proposing only to state a principle, and the President, pursuant to that general principle, executed some formal instrument with one or more foreign powers. I do not believe that anyone could use one of these short resolutions as a basis for contending that it is fair to say that the Senate had assented, by giving its proper advice and consent, so as to make it an obligation of the United States as a treaty.

If it went into great detail, as in the cases which the able Senator has particularized, and if the matter involved were merely a treaty with an Indian tribe, which would probably not be a matter of great national importance, involving some question of boundaries, payments, or their right to use lands, or a question concerning the payment of claims, or something like that, and the President should inquire of the Senate whether it would advise and consent, or whether it would recommend that he execute the agreement, if the Senate should advise and consent to it by a two-thirds vote, and sufficiently particularize what he was to do so that it would be a fair statement to say that the Senate intended to give him authority to go ahead and do it, and by giving him that authority, had advised and consented to it; that would be all right. But surely, on a matter of this importance and moment, no one would ever assume that the Senate, by a simple declaration of principle, even if it should go so far as to say that we favor the setting up of a world court, would mean thereby that it would agree to approve any kind of a court, constituted in any way, with any authority, which actually might be created as the result of the negotiation of the President with the foreign power.

I think it is extremely important that we give that advice—and I expect to go into the question fully tomorrow—because by giving the advice we at least lay down the broad outline of our views and sentiments.

There is certainly a degree of moral responsibility upon the Senate to make its ratification and its advice consistent; and certainly the proponents of such a treaty, if one were made, would be within their rights in coming back to the Senate when the question of ratification came up, and saying, "The Senate advised the Executive to make a treaty along these lines. We think it may be fairly said that he has followed the Senate's advice. We see no reason now to change our position." I believe it would be the duty of the Senate to ratify a treaty made pursuant to the advice which it gave; and I believe that such consideration should have considerable moral weight with the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator is firmly of the opinion that in this case such advice should not preclude a resubmission, I think the easy way to clarify it is to agree to an amendment to that effect, or at least make some unequivocal statement as to the requirement of Senate consent to a resulting treaty. So far as losing time in debate on a resubmission is concerned, I respectfully suggest that there is enough room for argument, for example, between one type of military force discussed awhile ago, and another type of military force, to occupy a long period of debate. There is no automatic foreclosure in the amendment of either arm of the debate.

Mr. PEPPER. What does the able Senator from Colorado understand to be the meaning of the words "acting through its constitutional processes" in the earlier part of paragraph 3 of both the resolution and the amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say to the able Senator that I am not sponsoring either provision. I am an earnest seeker after light.

Mr. PEPPER. If the able Senator and the majority of the Senate should not feel that the provision "acting through its constitutional processes" safeguards the Senate against the assumption that this advice would morally and legally bind it to ratify whatever may be executed pursuant to the advice, I am perfectly agreeable to an amendment which would so provide in appropriate language.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that something of that kind—something to require resubmission—is especially called for in view of the question already raised in the Senate as to what is an executive agreement, as distinguished from a treaty.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator raises a very interesting question as to what is an international executive agreement and what is a treaty. I propose to address myself to that question tomorrow, Mr. President, and show that one of the reasons why it is so essential that the Senate give adequate advice to the Executive is that in two instances within the recent memory of Senators, other Senators have insisted that instruments which were agreed to by the Congress be distinctly regarded as international agreements and not treaties. In some instances it has been insisted that they should be regarded as treaties and not international agreements. In other words, I propose to show that Senators who have not had a distinct record in favor of collaboration among nations with respect to the Panama Treaty, and in respect to the Relief and Rehabilitation Organization, have clearly indicated that they do not expect any future international agreement setting up a world organization to be regarded as an international agreement which might be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses. They have taken pains to see to it that any such arrangement as that is regarded technically as a treaty, therefore

requiring the vote of two-thirds of the Senate as a treaty does.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have listened to the debate between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Colorado, and this is the first time, in connection with the discussion of either the resolution or the amendment, that I have heard advanced the suggestion that what we might do here in connection with either would be binding upon the Senate, so far as the future is concerned. I have always understood that such action would be merely a recommendation to the President of the United States, and, indeed, not so much to the President, as more or less to the world, with respect to our position at this particular time. Our action would have nothing whatever to do with what some future Senate might do with respect to a treaty.

Mr. PEPPER. It would certainly have no legally binding effect.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I mean. It would merely express an opinion at this time, as to how the Senate, as now constituted, feels about international collaboration.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct, and I will say to him that he expresses my view exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as making a treaty was concerned, the President of the United States could either follow the views of the Senate or not follow them. It would be within his power to act as he chose, and it would be within the power of the Senate afterward either to ratify or not ratify any treaty the President might make in connection with the great problem confronting us. What we are all trying to do, as I see it, is to lay down some fundamental principle upon which the great majority can agree, in order to tell the President what the Senate believes is the proper path to pursue, and that if that path is pursued, ultimately, when the President returns to the Senate with some sort of a treaty in line with what we have agreed upon here, he can in advance depend upon the support of those in the Senate at that time. That is about the sum and substance of it. In other words, while I may be wrong about it, I do not believe that during previous wars resolutions of this character have been discussed in advance. Am I right or wrong about that?

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator is right about it. There have been many instances when the Senate has given advice, and I propose to refer to some of them in detail tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Insofar as a formal resolution is concerned, I think the resolution passed by the House is novel, and I think the resolution proposed in the Senate, if I understand the history of the past, is also new. The whole situation comes about because of what happened after the last war. It all comes about because we would like to tell our allies somewhat in advance as to what the United States Senate will do in the post-war period. As

I view the situation, because of our experience after the last war, when the President laid down his 14 points which it was thought would be adopted, but which were not ratified by the Senate, and because of what happened previous to Pearl Harbor, the Allied Nations want to know the sentiment and the attitude of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Only after I have warmly thanked the able Senator from Illinois for his very valuable contribution to the discussion.

Mr. HATCH. I do not care to open up the subject which the Senator from Illinois has touched upon by his questions, which are most pertinent, and which must be discussed before the debate shall be ended, but I do wish to add to what he said when he referred to other nations having a right to know the sentiment of the Senate, in view of the past history of our own country. I think the Senate of the United States is under an obligation to adopt some kind of a resolution, in order that our own people and our allies may know whether or not we are going to do as we did 25 years ago. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I very cordially thank the very able Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has raised a very important point, one which the Senate, in view of the citations given by the Senator from Colorado, cannot disregard. I gather from listening to the observations of the able Senator from Colorado and the cases he cited, that there have been instances in the past when previous action has been construed by the executive department as ratification, and the Executive has acted without referring a treaty to the Senate.

If I understood the Senator from Colorado correctly, the point he was making was that there might be danger in the Senate particularizing too much in a resolution of the kind before us at this time. I think the point is well taken, and I think it is one of the most cogent arguments I have heard made up to this time to sustain the contention that the Senate cannot afford now to particularize too much in advising the Executive as to what our stand is. In my opinion, the Senate can well afford to take the advice just given it, and in adopting the resolution, instead of particularizing to such an extent that the Executive might construe it as a ratification in advance, I think we should content ourselves by adopting the resolution in very general and broad terms, so that we may not have to regret our action a few months hence.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, from a remark or two the Senator from Florida has dropped, I apprehend he does not intend to conclude his remarks this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. I may say to my distinguished leader that his assumption is well founded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I think we might as well take a recess at this time.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no Executive Calendar, with the exception of the nominations of a few postmasters, and I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified immediately.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 27, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 26 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES MEDICAL CORPS To be colonels

Lt. Col. Harvey Robinson Livesay, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. Raymond Osborne Dart, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Frank Lieberman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Brooks Collins Grant, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Bell Foster, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 17, 1943.

Lt. Col. Chauncey Elmo Dovell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 29, 1943.

#### To be captains

First Lt. Arthur Lynn Burks, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from November 20, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Charles Hunter, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 21, 1943.

#### DENTAL CORPS

##### To be captain

First Lt. Edward Ernest Rose, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 11, 1943.

#### VETERINARY CORPS

##### To be colonel

Lt. Col. George Jacob Rife, Veterinary Corps, with rank from November 27, 1943.

#### PHARMACY CORPS

##### To be colonel

Lt. Col. Thomas Grimsley Hester, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from November 10, 1943.

#### CHAPLAINS

##### To be colonels

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Edward Lewis Trett, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from November 27, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Charles Coburn Merrill, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from November 28, 1943.

##### To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Arthur Carl Piepkorn, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from November 15, 1943.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 26 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

#### POSTMASTERS

##### GEORGIA

Julia C. Casey, Kingsland.

##### MINNESOTA

George Zahn, Bellingham.  
Oscar T. Lokensgard, Boyd.  
Gertrude C. Thompson, Cyrus.  
John G. Hawley, Sandstone.  
Benjamin C. Moe, Wanamingo.

##### NEVADA

Doris E. Larson, Stewart.

##### OKLAHOMA

William T. Barnes, Mountain Park.  
Ella Miller, Ramona.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*Our Father, who art in heaven, hal-  
lowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom  
come; Thy will be done on earth as it  
is in heaven. Give us this day our daily  
bread and forgive us our trespasses as  
we forgive those who trespass against  
us; and lead us not into temptation, but  
deliver us from evil, for Thine is the  
kingdom and the power and the glory  
forever.*

We pray in the name of Him who bears our grief, our burdens, and carries the sorrows of all mankind. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed



Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following agencies:

War Manpower Commission.  
National Youth Administration.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the October 16 issue of the newspaper Feedstuffs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: First, that I may address the House for 1 minute; and, second, that I may insert in the RECORD my remarks, including an editorial from the United States News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great many problems submitted to us; we have appropriated a great deal of money. Many of us here are thinking of ways in which we can keep track of that money. The suggestion has been made that the Congress of the United States establish subcommittees or some such method by which it will be able to keep contact with the organizations that are spending this money. To this end, it has been suggested that we appropriate sufficient money to have the necessary research personnel at our disposal, so that we can make sure what these appropriations are actually used for.

I should like to call your attention to the insertions which I am making separately in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

#### WAGES OF RAILROAD WORKERS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### CEILING PRICES ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that another wholly unnecessary and unjustified blow is about to be dealt the meat producers in this country. The Office of Price Administration is reported to have decided on a price ceiling order to apply to live cattle, and the order is now on the desk of Economic Stabilizer Fred M. Vinson for his final approval or disapproval.

This proposal has been studied by the livestock industry and has been condemned as unworkable. The National Advisory Committee on Livestock and Meat has likewise held that it is not practical to establish a ceiling price on live cattle. Ceiling prices on beef in the butcher shops has long been in effect. But there are so many different types, sizes, flesh conditions, ages, and other factors that enter into values of live animals, that it is simply not practical to put an arbitrary price ceiling on the live animal.

Now, what effect will such an order have on the producer? It will, like the roll-back, have the direct and certain result of discouraging and reducing production and marketing of cattle. It will add to the confusion and uncertainty that has already depressed the market.

With the increase in food production so vital at this time, it is hard to understand why more red tape and impractical regulations should be ordered. Increase in or maintaining of production results from practical, sound programs that have the effect of encouraging and not discouraging production. Mr. Vinson should not allow this proposal to go into effect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

#### PATRIOTISM PLUS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONKMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (H. DOC. 343)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, October 25, 1943.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: There has recently been much loose and harmful talk about the employees of the Federal Government. In an effort to discredit those in the public service, groundless charges are being made and irresponsible rumors circulated that the Federal Government is a haven for "draft dodgers" and "slackers."

In simple justice to the many fine, public-spirited, and devoted persons in the Government employ, these unfair accusations must be emphatically denied.

Here are the true facts concerning the draft deferment of Government employees. I am sending them to you so that they may be made a part of the permanent record.

On July 31, 1943 (the latest date for which complete figures are available), there were in the Government service 2,825,904 full-time employees—men and

women—in the continental United States—less than 9 percent of whom work in Washington. According to the latest available information, it is estimated that there were 154,500 additional civilian employees outside the continental United States, the greater part of whom were working for the War and Navy Departments or for the Panama Canal.

In addition, there were 145,808 part-time paid employees, such as consultants, specialists, and forest-fire fighters. Two hundred and fifty-one thousand six hundred and sixty-three persons were working without compensation or for \$1 a year, such as members of local ration and draft boards and industrial advisers. It has been the Government's policy not to seek deferments for part-time or uncompensated employees or for dollar-a-year men. We can thus at the outset dispose of about 400,000 persons who under no circumstances can be regarded as "draft dodgers."

Of the 2,825,904 full-time, paid civilian employees in the United States, 1,952,700 men and women, or more than two-thirds, are employed by the War and Navy Departments. Let us consider first these civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments.

The greater part of them are engaged in war production in Government arsenals, ordnance plants, powder factories, and navy yards, or in essential work at Government depots, warehouses, proving grounds, air bases, naval training stations, and Government hospitals. They consist of engineers, draftsmen, mechanics, skilled artisans, procurement experts, scientists, specialists, and administrative personnel. They perform many difficult and important functions with regard to the far-flung supply, production, and other problems of the Army and Navy.

If the items of war material now being made in these Government-owned plants were produced, instead, in civilian-owned plants, the working men and women would be the very same civilians—and in the same number. And they would be deferred as essential war workers the same as other essential war workers are deferred.

Those who constantly bemoan the rapid growth of Government pay rolls usually overlook the fact that it takes hundreds of thousands of men and women to produce guns and ammunition in Government arsenals and to construct and repair battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines in Government navy yards, the same as in privately owned and operated plants. One hundred percent of the battleships now in construction, 43 percent of the aircraft carriers, 10 percent of the cruisers, 8 percent of the destroyers, and about 31 percent of the submarines are being built in these Government yards. Our civilian workers make 86 percent of the Garand rifles built in this country. These are just a few examples.

The War and Navy Departments, like private manufacturers, must see to it that production is not disrupted by the



drafting of their workers before systematic arrangements for their replacement are made. Accordingly, replacement schedules, similar to those used in private war plants and factories, have been prepared for most Army and Navy civilian workers. Deferments for such workers in these departments operate on the same basis as in private industry; viz, the deferment lasts for a limited period of time, during which new people—women or older men or younger boys—are trained to take the place of those who are inducted into the Army or Navy—except those who are indispensable and irreplaceable. These replacement schedules have to be approved by the Selective Service System before they become effective.

The vast majority of these 1,952,700 civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments consist of women, men below or over draft age, men who have been classified as physically unfit, and fathers. According to the records of Selective Service, less than 5 percent of all of the civilian employees in these departments—or about 84,000—have been deferred for occupational reasons. Men of draft age are constantly being released for military duty and are being replaced in accordance with replacement schedules. This record is much better than the occupational deferments in private industry.

Those civilians in the Army and Navy who have been deferred are preponderantly workers in the field outside of Washington. Thus, of the 36,672 departmental employees of the War Department in Washington, 364 are now deferred. Of the 19,000 departmental employees of the Navy in Washington, only 1,016 are now deferred. Those deferred are primarily engineers, draftsmen, naval architects, and other technical personnel.

If the slackers are not harbored by the War and Navy Departments, have they found their haven in the other Government departments and agencies?

No employee in the other Government departments and agencies is allowed to request his own deferment from his local draft board. No local draft board is allowed to defer any Government employee on occupational grounds unless the deferment has been requested by the employing agency and has received the approval of an independent Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees consisting of three public officials and organized by Executive order.

Deferment will be approved by this Review Committee only in the case of Government employees who occupy key positions, or who are engaged in highly specialized and essential work, or who possess unique fitness and skill which are difficult to replace. The concept of a key position is narrowly limited to positions requiring an unusual degree of responsibility and specialized skill, and involving serious difficulty of replacement.

It is clear, therefore, that the standards of deferment of Government workers are much stricter than those governing deferments in private employment.

A worker in private industry, unlike the Government employee, may request his own deferment, even though his employer does not see fit to do so. There is no agency in private industry comparable to this Review Committee of the Government which passes upon job classifications and carefully scrutinizes claims for deferment of workers. Nor, in private industry, is deferment limited to employees who hold key positions. Finally, the fact that the worker is engaged in any of the 2,000 occupations classified as essential by the War Manpower Commission may properly be considered by the local draft boards in the case of private workers; but, despite the fact that Government service has been classified as an essential activity, the local draft boards cannot defer a man in Government service, not on a replacement schedule, except in accordance with the foregoing rules. The Government, moreover, is handicapped by the fact that, due to budgetary limitations, it cannot always take on and train new employees to replace men who are about to be inducted.

I am informed that some local boards, on their own initiative, have granted occupational deferments to some Government employees without any prior request of the Government. Many of these deferments were obtained before the Executive order establishing the Review Committee was issued. These deferments are now unauthorized. We are actively searching out such cases and when they are discovered appropriate action is being taken.

The figures compiled by the Review Committee reflect the strictness of the Government's policy on occupational deferments.

The Post Office Department is the largest employer in the Government after the War and Navy Departments. It has 315,741 employees, of whom 307,817 are located outside of Washington. These are the men who deliver the mail and operate local post offices. No deferments have been sought by the postal authorities for any employees with the single exception of postal inspectors. These inspectors are engaged in highly skilled work requiring years of experience. They investigate postal frauds, check the accounts of the local postmasters, and do important work for the Army and Navy. Only 61 men—all of them postal inspectors—have received deferments. Twelve of these 61 are fathers. The number deferred is, therefore, less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total post-office personnel.

The post office certainly does not look like a "haven" for "draft dodgers."

Of the remaining Government employees, nearly half are women. About 119,380 are men of draft age, exclusive of a few small agencies whose reports have not yet been submitted. Of these men, 25,537 are single, 26,195 are married without children, and 67,647 are married with children.

Let us turn first to the 25,537 single men. By August 15, 1943, 3,582 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction, ready to

go into the armed forces; 11,667 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service, and 1,502 had been given a class III classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 2,743. The lack of information with respect to the classification of these employees is due, in part, to the failure of some individual employees to report promptly to the Government their induction or any change in their draft status, and to the delays involved in compiling figures received from the field. Occupational deferments had been received by only 6,043.

I should like to analyze these 6,043 somewhat more in detail:

A. One thousand and seventy-seven of these are in the Department of Commerce;

One hundred and ninety in the Bureau of Standards are engaged in scientific work of prime importance to the war;

One hundred and thirty-nine in the Weather Bureau are meteorologists or weather observers;

One hundred and seventy-eight in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are engaged in exploration and mapping of coastal defense waters;

Five hundred and fifty-four in the Civil Aeronautics Administration operate the net work of Federal airways used almost exclusively now by Army and Navy aircraft;

Thirteen in the United States Patent Office are physicists, chemists, and scientists, studying patents of potential value in this mechanized war;

Three are bureau chiefs.

B. There are 1,225 single men in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who are in class II. These agents investigate cases of espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities and perform other duties so intimately related to the war that they might easily be considered members of the armed forces.

C. Another 1,800 employed by various agencies and departments are overseas, many in actual combat zones. These consist mainly of employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey charting North Pacific waters, civil aeronautical personnel engaged in air traffic control and airways communications, radio monitor operators, operating railway workers, F. B. I. agents, operating and maintenance employees of the Panama Canal, technicians, engineers, pilots, members of the Foreign Diplomatic Service, and representatives of foreign economic agencies.

D. Among the other deferred are 132 radio operators and radio technicians in the Federal Communications Commission, 387 engineers and geologists in the Department of the Interior, 352 specialists in the Department of Agriculture engaged in the inspection of food, the growing of guayule for rubber, in the protection of our national forests, or in the protection of our farms against plant or animal disease, 60 inspectors protecting our borders against illegal entry or smuggling; 60 scientists in the United States Public Health Service or the



United States Food and Drug Administration; 278 scientists, engineers, and chemists in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority engaged in construction of flood-control dams and the building and operation of power plants, and 84 in the Maritime Commission supervising our ship-construction program.

This accounts for 5,455 of the 6,043 deferred single men. The remaining deferred employees occupy key positions in the various departments and agencies.

If the normal experience of selective service holds true with this group, about 40 percent would be ineligible anyway for military service by reason of their physical condition.

Nonproduction Federal employees abroad, that is, those not engaged in actual production of war materials or facilities, are now being individually examined by the Review Committee to make certain that those only physically unfit for military service or those possessing exceptional qualifications are granted continued deferment.

The same holds true of the 26,195 married men without children in the Government employ. Of these 26,195 men, 5,287 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction on August 5, 1943, 6,730 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service, and 5,635 had been given a class III classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 594.

The number deferred for occupational reasons was 7,949. Like the single men, they are all engaged in work essential to the prosecution of the war and their cases have been carefully examined by the Review Committee. Here, too, about 40 percent would be found ineligible for military service by reason of their physical condition.

There are, besides, 2,003 uniformed personnel running the War Shipping Administration training organization and 14,050 cadets receiving training in the training-organization schools for service in the merchant marine, who have also been deferred. These men are not really part of the civilian establishment of the Government.

The broad, over-all, unfounded charges of "draft dodgers" in Government service are particularly unfair to our Federal personnel. I am convinced that they are anxious to put on their country's uniform and that they have been kept, often against their will, in their present jobs. Their Government itself, and not the men as individuals, decided that they could be more useful to its war effort where they are.

This attempted discrediting of the public service is also unfair to the many who left the Government to enter the armed forces and who plan to return to their positions after the war. Unfortunately the statistics of those ex-employees of the Government now in the armed services are incomplete, but their very number would silence the mudslingers. As of January 1, 1943, there

were 238,154 Federal employees in the armed services. The estimated number today is approximately double that amount—or about a half million.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

#### AMENDMENT TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 330, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 763, amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] and I would appreciate if the Chair would let me know when I have used 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order a very important bill providing for the inducting of all available men before fathers are called. It embodies the principles of the Kilday bill which, as you recollect, was passed by the House nearly 5 months ago and permitted to sleep that many months. It was not until a few days ago that a Senator or some Senators began to demand action against the drafting of fathers and this notwithstanding, as I have stated, that the Kilday bill has been over there awaiting action all these months. Finally the Senate has acted and instead of taking up the Kilday House bill a Senate bill was reported and passed, which the House Committee on Military Affairs has, after careful study and consideration, substituted its own bill and reported it to the House. That is the bill now before us as a substitute for the Senate bill and after 2 hours' general debate will be read under the 5-minute rule for amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the Committee on Military Affairs and especially the gentleman from California [Mr. Costello], chairman of the subcommittee, in submitting to the House a

real constructive, splendidly drafted, and safeguarded bill. When the hearing was held on the request of the Committee on Military Affairs for the granting of a rule for the special consideration of the bill by the House the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Kilday], another member of that committee, appeared before the Committee on Rules and upon their intelligent explanation of the provisions of the bill, I am pleased to say that the Committee on Rules unanimously granted a rule. I shall leave it to the chairman and subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to give the House a more detailed and complete explanation of the provisions of the bill, section by section, and to acquaint the House with the deliberations of and facts presented to their committee which led to the adoption of the committee substitute for the Senate bill. I feel that the substitute has been carefully worked out and will do what the vast majority of the Members desire to be done and what the country is seeking to have done with respect to the order of draft inductions.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased that the President of the United States has sent the message that has just been read. It is a timely message and thoroughly explains the number of men in the Government service who have been exempted and for whom exemption has been requested and should serve to estop certain gentlemen in continuing their harpings that thousands of Government employees have been wrongfully exempted. The President always does things on time and at the proper time. He saves me the task of explaining the situation in a much abler manner than I could attempt. Consequently, I will not waste your time or mine in calling attention to the unjustifiable criticism of some Members and others, particularly on the other side, who have been endeavoring to make the people believe that the entire Federal Government in Washington consisted of draft-evading employees. It was charged at one time that there were over 180,000 single men in the Government employ who should be in the armed services. I think the President has made it clear that there have been no unnecessary or unjustifiable exemptions in the case of Government employees. If there were, his appointment of a commission to make a thorough check and investigation of all those who might have been erroneously or wrongfully exempted, has corrected that situation.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot refuse to yield to the gentleman, who is a most useful member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HALLECK. I am always interested in what the very distinguished Chairman of the Rules Committee has to say. He referred a moment ago to some things that have been stated at times about people in the Federal service in Washington avoiding the draft or selective service. Of course, many such



things have been said in the past, but will not the gentleman agree with me that undoubtedly the saying of those things has done much to accomplish the better result that today exists? Does not the gentleman agree with me that there were many people who were deferred who since have gone into the service, and but for some of the things that were said here and at other places might yet be deferred?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Indiana knows that I love to agree with him at all times, especially when he is right. And, referring to the Members on that side, I think he is right more often than most of them and nearly all of the time is fair which, I regret, I cannot say about most of the Republicans. I congratulate him upon the tremendous amount of constructive work he has done to aid in solving the conditions that confront us.

I agree that criticism, fair, just criticism is healthy and beneficial. I am always pleased when a gentleman who has the facts carefully criticizes any wrongful act, but I do dislike and resent unfair, unjust, and untrue statements being made from time to time, statements that are not based on the facts and are without any evidence whatever behind them.

The gentleman from Indiana knows that already the President has acted by creating a board, which has investigated all those who might have been exempted, and I will not say that some of them have not been properly exempted.

I think this legislation is in the right direction, is wholesome and will be beneficial. I will tell you why I am especially interested in this proposal. Most of you have heard General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral King, and others. After listening to these men the country cannot take for granted that the war is already won. We have a hard, hard task before us. I feel that it is the duty of everyone of us and every red-blooded American to desist from doing anything that could in any way bring about disunity. We should work harmoniously, we should work unitedly in the interest of bringing about a perfectly coordinated activity that will help those millions who are now overseas to achieve an early victory and effect the defeat of the men who have so brutally brought about this war without any justification. It is my hope that within a short time the war will be ended and these courageous men who have been inducted will return to us in a healthy and uninjured condition.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, knows that as far as I am concerned as a Member of the House and as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I have had two serious difficulties in the enactment of all of this selective-service legislation. The first thing I had to come to that worked on my feelings and my heart quite a bit was the lowering of the draft age to include the 18- and 19-year-old youngsters. I had to surrender that position. Then I assumed

the attitude of being opposed to inducting fathers until it became necessary to do so. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the proposed legislation that will be considered under the rule the gentleman is so ably discussing will ameliorate or lighten the shock somewhat on the fathers and the heads of homes in the country?

Mr. SABATH. There is no question that it will. I have stated in my humble way, perhaps not as clearly as I might have, that I feel that the Committee on Military Affairs has done a splendid job and has eliminated the objections and finally succeeded in evolving for the country a bill that will exempt the fathers until all the single men and non-fathers have been called. That I consider proper and just, and I believe the country demands it.

Mr. Speaker, to gain an early victory over the despicable Nazis and Japs so that freedom and liberty will continue to be ours, and so that our democratic form of government will not be destroyed, we must obtain and maintain complete unity and harmony.

To do this it is imperative to put a stop to the seditious activities of all malevolent forces in our midst, whether they be the direct or indirect tools of George Sylvester Viereck, or of the many professional organizers, publicists, or economists, and their vicious intolerant propaganda sheets, and those haters of the President and the New Deal who fail to realize that this is not the time to create discord, disunity, and resentment.

It is believed that men, whether in public or private life, who thrive on un-American and subversive activities should be stopped from disseminating propaganda which affects and precludes complete cooperation in order to enable us to give our armed forces the support and aid which they rightfully deserve.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of solidarity and unified action we should ferret out and bring to account anyone and everyone, it matters not what high position he may hold, many of whom feel themselves to be above the Government and the Constitution, and because not having been proceeded against criminally as yet are immune from the law and the wrath of public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a unanimous report from both the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Rules. I know of no opposition to it at least under the rule. When the consideration under the 5-minute rule is reached there may be some important amendments offered.

The bill is far more than a gesture, as some people have been trying to claim. If the intent of Congress is carried out—and I regret to say it is not always carried out these days—it will protect the married men with children and will take into the armed forces all available single men and married men without children. If that is done it will carry out not only the will of the Congress, I believe, on

both sides of the aisle but the will of about 75 or 80 percent of the American people. I will discuss the main provision of the bill in a few minutes.

I thought I should like to make some comment on the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules. Listening to him and to the President's report, one would think there was not a single draft dodger among the 3,000,000 Federal employees. The record shows that 84,000 deferments were requested officially by the administration. As I have stated repeatedly on the floor of the House, in my humble opinion that is exactly 84,000 too many. Not one of these jobs is indispensable. They can all be filled by older men, by veterans of the last war, by women, or by persons who are disabled; yet 84,000 deferments have been asked officially by the various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government. However, here is a total of 115,000 deferred by local boards, men who go before local boards and claim they are in the Government service and therefore ought to be deferred; and they have been given deferments, deferments not officially asked by the Government but requested by themselves because of their Federal jobs. They are hiding away in Government fox holes and dugouts, on safe jobs, many without children, with their wives on Government pay rolls, while 2 or 3 in a family are drafted back home.

I think the observation of the gentleman from Indiana nearly hit the nail on the head. For a long time Members of the House like the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and others, have been calling the attention of the House and the American public to the situation among the Federal officeholders hiding away in Government dugouts, and have literally forced a great many of them into the armed forces. I am told that Mr. Abe Fortas, the Under Secretary of the Interior, is going into the service on Monday. A number of speeches have been made about the draft status of Mr. Abe Fortas. He is probably a most estimable gentleman. Certainly it is not a question of personality. However, he is of draft age, 30 or 32 years of age, and is receiving \$10,000 a year. He has a wife on the Government pay roll receiving \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year. Certainly he should lead the way in serving in our armed forces. He should have volunteered long ago and set an example to all the rest of the Federal employees to serve in defense of their country in time of war.

These cases have all been brought out repeatedly on the floor of the House, the Fortas case, the Ginsburg case—Ginsburg wanted to be a colonel overnight until the Congress stopped it—the Keyserling case—he is not in yet—the Nathan case, and others. I have not discussed them except the Fortas case because I did not know the facts, but other Members of the House have discussed them and have forced some of them into the armed forces, and a great



many others along with them. I do not believe that all of them are in yet by a jugful. I hope that all Government employees of draft age will be compelled to serve in our armed forces and that no deferments will be granted.

I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs on bringing out a highly important and constructive piece of legislation. This whole question of deferring the fathers has been kicked around and around and around in the other body for months at a time and compromise piled upon compromise until confusion became worse confounded. The House committee has brought in today a constructive piece of legislation that does exactly what we wanted to do in the beginning. I hope it will go through in 10 days' time and will be made effective and the intent of the law carried out by those in authority.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, in referring to the legislation heretofore having been kicked around has reference to the fact that in another body the principles embodied in this legislation were not merely kicked around, but were smothered to death.

Mr. FISH. Naturally, and massacred to make a political holiday.

Mr. MAY. And we hope that this will not meet a like fate.

Mr. FISH. It will not, because it is going to go through the House by an enormous vote, and I think the conferees will have to pay some attention to it, and besides it has public opinion behind it.

#### PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture be permitted to sit during general debate on this bill this afternoon for the purpose of hearing some members of the O. P. A. organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman explain how this bill will work out so far as the drafting of fathers is concerned?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I propose to do that, because I want to explain how this bill works in a simple manner. As I understand it, and if I am wrong I want to be corrected by members of the Military Committee, this is a very simple bill, and when bills are simple they are apt to be effective. All it does is to create a Na-

tional and State pool so that single men will be taken first.

Let me answer my friend from New York, to put it in this way, that we assume that all of the single men from the State of New York have been taken into the draft, through the Selective Service Act, and that over in Connecticut there are 10,000 or 20,000 single men left. Under this bill it will put those 20,000 single men into the service so that they will be taken before the married men with children in New York. That is all it does, and that is all we want to do, if we have to take the married men. If this war goes on year after year, we may have to take all of the married men, and I would favor taking all of the men up to 64 if we were attacked in America and that it was necessary to do so. That is not the question before us. We have not the shipping to take all the eligibles, and therefore, we ought to take the single men first, and then the married men without children and last of all, married men with children. Further, it puts the power back where it belongs, under the head of the Selective Service, General Hershey, and takes it away from the Manpower Commission, that has evidently confused the whole issue.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let us go one step further, and assume now for a minute that all of the pool of single men are taken up. How are you going to take the married men? Will you take those without children first?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. The bill says so. But I am not here to explain the bill in detail, and that is not my function. The bill prescribes that after taking the single men, then the married men without children will be taken, and the pre-Pearl Harbor married men with children come last.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What will this bill do with regard to single men in industry, who have been deferred and whose places might be taken by older men or women?

Mr. FISH. I would like to have the committee explain that in detail but the bill requires industry to screen those, and not to give them exemptions which they have in the past, and arrange to get qualified men or women to substitute in their places. The question is, Have we come to the bottom of the barrel, and must we take, after all of the single men and the married men without children have been inducted, the married men with children? I submit that we have not approached the bottom of the barrel. It is not necessary in my opinion to take the pre-Pearl Harbor married men with children. First I believe you can get a great many right out of the Federal employees. I think we could obtain two or three hundred thousand more single men of draft age and married men without children out of the 3,000,000 Federal employees alone, and get more than that out of industry.

I propose to offer another suggestion that has not been raised in the House,

I think, whereby in my humble opinion you can get another two or three hundred thousand men without any difficulty whatsoever. That is in reclassifying the Negroes. Perhaps the House might be interested in some figures as to the number of Negroes taken by the Selective Service, and the number that has been rejected. The figures are startling, and I am quite sure, speaking as a friend of the Negroes, that they would like to be in the armed forces, that they do not want to be set aside because of lack of education or because they cannot read or write.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes more.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that plans are being made to train men very quickly for the service now.

Mr. FISH. I hope so; and I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, having had some experience in the last war as an infantry commander of Negro troops, that some of our troops could not read or write. One of the best men in my outfit, George Jackson, of Goshen, N. Y., could not read or write, yet he could take a machine gun apart and put it together again blindfolded when hardly anybody else could do it with their eyes wide open. It does not require educational qualifications or school or college certificates, or ability to read and write to shoot a rifle, or to have good eyesight, to be able to march and fight in defense of your country.

I submit a great many of those who are fighting in the armies of our allies and our enemies cannot read or write. But they can shoot a gun and fight and kill and be killed.

These are the figures: Negro rejections 641,000 under the Selective Service Act. Negro inductions, 688,000. Practically an equal number of Negroes have been refused, largely on account of educational qualifications; not being able to read or write. There are other reasons, but that is the greatest one by far.

I submit there ought to be a rescreening and reclassification of all these rejected Negroes. They want to serve in the armed forces, but they are shut out largely because of that single fact, that they are not able to read and write. I submit that they will make just as good soldiers if properly trained; and they will shoot just as well if they have the proper eyesight. They are physically strong. Most of them from the South come off the farms and are healthy specimens and will probably make good soldiers. So, if you want manpower in the Army, if you want to increase it by two or three hundred thousand, then I suggest you rescreen or reclassify these 641,000 Negroes who have been rejected under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. With the utmost humility I want to ask the gentleman how about our allies below the Rio Grande? Have they no soldiers to offer as combatant troops? Has the gentleman thought that over?

Mr. FISH. I have thought that over.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. However, that is not worrying me very much because we cannot force them to fight. We cannot force them to go overseas. Has the gentleman ever thought that over that the Canadians, the Australians, and the South Africans are not drafted for overseas service and do not go except as volunteers? They are not drafted to fight overseas. To my mind, that is a far more important question because they are in the war 100 percent, like we are, yet their men are not obliged to serve overseas.

Mr. GIFFORD. They are doing it. They are going overseas, but south of the Rio Grande we cannot force them, but we can promise them and assure them so that they will be our allies that we will protect them.

Mr. FISH. Yes; we will protect them, anyway, but we are sending our boys overseas at 18 years of age. Even the British do not send them overseas at 18. They keep them until they are 19 before they are sent overseas to battle, yet we are reaching down into the bottom of the barrel and taking everybody, and half of our allies are not sending any draftees overseas. We ought to know those facts in considering our own manpower limitations.

Furthermore, let me point out to the gentleman, who is interested in economy, we have spent already more money on this war—and we have been in it less than 2 years—than all of our allies and our enemies combined.

Let me say in conclusion, we have been in this war 23 months—on the 7th of December it will be 2 years. In the last war colored troops were on the front line fighting within 12 months after war was declared. I know that to be a fact, because my own regiment was in the front lines in April 1918. Almost 2 years have gone by and I do not know of any colored infantry regiments being anywhere in a combat zone. I do not know of any colored combat troops anywhere, either in Europe or in the far Pacific or anywhere else, in a combat zone. They are serving as stevedores, noncombat engineers, in quartermaster detachments, and in unloading transports, but practically none of the 600,000 colored soldiers are in combat units fighting in the front line where they want to be and where they ought to be and have a right to be, the same as any other American troops.

I submit if you want to get 300,000 or 400,000 more colored soldiers all you have to do is to rescreen or reclassify those 641,000 rejected Negroes. Then you will not have to take married men

with children for 6 months if ever. The people in my district and in your district are more interested in this bill than all the internationalism and international proposals that have been advanced and the proposed settlement of post-war problems which we cannot solve until we have won the war and know what the British and the Russian Governments war and peace aims are. The people back home are vitally interested in the immediate passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, then I shall not use any further time and I will not answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] as I would like to. I realize that many of the Members desire to get away and desire to finish this bill as it should be finished.

Therefore I shall now move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 763, with Mr. COLMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as provided by the rule, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I might first point out the principal things this legislation is intended to accomplish. First among those is the fact that we are endeavoring to centralize control, management, and operation of the Selective Service Act exclusively in the hands of the Director of Selective Service. I think this will materially aid in eliminating the confusion that has existed from time to time by various orders going out from different agencies of the Government who had a part in the handling of selective service.

The second item of importance here is an endeavor to see to it that fathers shall be drafted after the drafting of single persons and nonfathers. By this means we hope that the drafting of fathers will be withheld as long as possible and that wherever there are pools of single men or of married men without children anywhere in the country that those men shall be inducted into the service ahead of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. This we hope will be done on both a Nation-wide as well as a State-wide basis.

Of course, we realize that it is not possible to induct the last available single

person on any given date before a father would be drafted. This is especially true because of the fact that the status of countless persons changes from day to day. Persons deferred have the deferments canceled; classifications are constantly undergoing change; even the marital status may change; hence complete adherence to this procedure cannot be had, but it is our desire that selective service establish the necessary regulations so that in filling each quota call the available nonfathers known to exist on any given call day will be inducted wherever they may be located, either within the confines of a State or within a small area of a State, before the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers are inducted. On this basis quotas will be adjusted throughout the Nation to drain single individuals and nonfathers from those States where there is an excess, and likewise the quotas of the local boards in a State having an excess of single persons and nonfathers will be augmented so as to drain these individuals off, while reducing the quotas elsewhere where only fathers are available. As a matter of fact, Selective Service informs us they are endeavoring to do just that at the present time.

Also, we put a provision in that same section, which is section (m) in the House amendment, which provides that there shall be no group inductions. We provided in the law originally that men shall not be deferred because of any group classification or because of any industry classification, but that each question of deferment shall be handled upon an individual basis. We have included a converse provision in this bill which provides that when it comes to the induction of any person his case shall be handled individually and that he shall not be inducted into the armed services because he happens to be employed in a particular occupation ahead of others who are also classified I-A but happen to be employed in a different occupation; that all persons classified I-A shall be inducted into service in accordance with their order number. I believe the committee report reads "serial number"; it should read "order number."

Likewise, we have a provision here that where a registrant has received an occupational deferment that such occupational deferment is subject to review in the area in which that person is working. We feel that this should be done in order to obviate the difficulty that we have found existing here in the Federal Government where we have some 30,000 or more cases of unofficial occupational deferments, persons who have been deferred from military service simply on the action of the local draft board but with no official request from any Government department or agency having been made for the deferment of that individual.

By calling for a review of those occupational deferments in the area in which the person is employed, rather than in the State in which he registered, we feel that these unjustified occupational deferments will be eliminated. In other words, that the Government workers who are employed in the city of Washington, re-



ardless of the place in which they may have registered originally, if they are deferred, within 30 days after the enactment of this legislation those deferments will be processed by the appeals boards located here in the District of Columbia, and any new deferments that are granted locally will be reviewed within 10 days by the appeals board here in the area in which those persons are employed. This, I think, will very largely clear up many of these occupation deferments that have been granted. Similar unofficial deferments undoubtedly exist in industry, and it is felt that this provision calling for a review of all out-of-State deferments will remedy this situation.

A further point that is being considered in this legislation for the first time is that we are authorizing those persons who are about to be inducted to request a preinduction physical examination. Many persons have gone up for induction and have been told that they could not qualify, yet they had considered themselves to be physically fit, but it is not until they are actually on the point of induction that they get a full military physical examination and then find they are not physically fit, that they do not meet the standards and are going to be placed in IV-F. As a result they are rejected after they have disposed of their business, or their occupation, in the belief they are about to enter the military service. In this bill we authorize them to request and to receive a preinduction physical examination. That will obviate that situation. Men will be able to take their physical examinations and have that question settled. The results of the physical examination are to be reported back to the local draft board and are binding on the draft board just the same as the examination following induction.

Another provision creates a five-man medical board. On this board one member is to be an Army medical officer, one a Navy medical officer, and three are to be civilian physicians who are not in the employ of the Government.

This medical board is being directed to review the physical requirements of the armed services and to determine whether some changes cannot be recommended for the Army and Navy. The qualifications of those persons who are being used for limited service are likewise to be looked into and recommendations made in the hope that a larger number of men may be used for limited service and that more men may be used in the armed services without having so many rejected and placed in the category of IV-F.

We have added a final provision in the bill directing the Director of Selective Service or his chief liaison officer or some other officer in the Selective Service to request information from the various agencies of the Government regarding deferments, rejections, replacement schedules, and the like. In the past there occasionally has been some difficulty in obtaining the information that was desired, and for this reason we specifically mention not only the Director but his liaison officer or other officer whom he may designate to obtain this information

and to report it back to both the House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs, as well as to make such reports at any interval of time at which those committees may request these reports.

The final section of the bill provides that any provisions of existing law, and other acts, which may conflict with the provisions of this act shall not affect this act. We did that in order that any broad provisions of power that may have been granted to the President under the War Powers Act or similar legislation will not obviate the intent of Congress at this time in trying to accomplish these purposes.

I might also make one comment that an amendment was suggested for the merchant seamen. These men are not directly a part of the armed services. On the contrary, they are, you may say, the unarmed warriors of this war, but because of the fact that they are a very essential group of men, it is my personal feeling they should be treated in similar manner to persons in the armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, these men who are in training at the present time are being deferred. Men who are engaged actively as seamen on cargo vessels and other ships are being deferred, but some of those who are engaged in the work of training these seamen have not been granted deferment by some of the boards. It is my feeling that these men should be granted deferments generally by the boards throughout the country and that the Director of Selective Service should see to it that the boards are notified that men engaged in this program, either as trainers or trainees, should be granted deferments so long as they remain active in that program.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. May I supplement the cases given by the gentleman by saying that those who actually have received training at the expense of the United States Government have been called back by the induction board and nothing I have been able to do or anyone else can keep them out. They have been taken in the Army, after the money has been spent by the United States to train them, and some of them were needed engineers.

Mr. COSTELLO. I agree with the gentleman, but I feel this can be handled directly by the regulations of Selective Service. We did not want to include them in here as a class because we did not want any group deferments any more than we wanted group inductions. We felt each case should be handled on an individual basis because of the nature of the work. Because they are necessary in the conduct of the war in connection with supplying the Army and the Navy we felt these men certainly should be given definite treatment by each board in the country on a uniform basis and they

should be granted deferments so long as they remained active in that branch of service, the Merchant Marine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are these the young men who are officers and seamen on our merchant vessels?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me as though they are playing a very important part in this war and that the position taken by the gentleman from California is not only a sound one but a necessary one in connection with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. COSTELLO. I agree with the gentleman and I think that is true. In my opinion, the Selective Service will see to it that these men are uniformly granted deferments so long as they remain active in the merchant marine.

The United States Maritime Service is a statutory organization having military rank although not having military status as a part of the armed service. At present it is under the jurisdiction of the War Shipping Administration and its training program is quite similar in nature to that being conducted at the training stations of the Navy and the Coast Guard. The continuity of employment of persons engaged in the conduct of the training program is very essential for the efficient operation of the training stations. Approximately 3,000 men subject to Selective Service are engaged in conducting the training program for licensed and unlicensed personnel of our merchant marine. Although efforts have been made to use women or discharged veterans where possible in administrative work, it is generally necessary that a reasonable number of persons subject to the draft must necessarily be engaged in the training program and so require deferment. Uniform treatment for all such persons should be accorded and Selective Service should see to it that when each individual case is considered that the local boards realize the essential character of the work being performed and should grant the deferments required.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman spoke about men in the limited service. Is it not a fact that the armed forces today are releasing the limited service men, that there is no such thing as a limited service now and that people who were inducted for limited service and who were not physically fit, have been sent across?

Mr. COSTELLO. Some persons have been brought into the service for limited use only. In my opinion, a larger number should be so utilized. I feel by proper organization the War Department could without too great difficulty employ a larger number of persons with some slight physical handicaps.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The intention of using limited-service men was to put

them in a place where they could release able-bodied men?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes; in order to make it possible for the able-bodied men to be used for combat duty. The limited-service men were to be used at home and not called for combat duty.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman stated that the local board would have jurisdiction in the city in which the person lives; is that right?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes. The situation that we are providing for here is as follows: A person registers in the community in which he lives; subsequently he may move to another area and be employed. If that person is deferred, the deferment is to be reviewed by the appeal board in the area in which he works. It is only in the case where a man is deferred. If he is deferred, that deferment is reviewed by the appeal board in the area in which he works. They will pass upon whether it should have been granted or should not have been granted and their decision will be final in that particular case. As far as the individual is concerned, he still would be classified by his local board. If he is not deferred by his local board he may appeal to his State appeal board at the place in which he resided and registered. He can make his appeal in the normal fashion and in that manner. The provision we have in here is limited only to those cases where an occupational deferment has been granted. That occupational deferment must be reviewed by the appeal board in the area in which he works.

Mr. BLOOM. If that person in Washington should move out of Washington to Pittsburgh again, would he have another chance to go before the board there with reference to his particular case?

Mr. COSTELLO. If the person changes occupation or changes the place of his employment there should be a review of his classification. In other words, those who are already classified will be reviewed within 30 days after the passage of the act. No further review of continuing deferments would be necessary as long as they retain their same occupation. Those who are newly classified or newly deferred would be reviewed within the 10-day period.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not believe the gentleman made clear the fact that the employee himself may appeal to the appeal board in the locality where he is working if his own draft board has classified him as I-A and his own draft board is located in some other State.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is quite correct. In addition to that the language of this legislation provides that in the cases where occupational deferments have been granted, these shall be reviewed by the appeal boards in the areas in which the men are employed.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. On the application of the employer?

Mr. COSTELLO. The review of an occupational deferment in these cases is mandatory and no request or application is required.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman probably listened to the spanking administered to us this morning by the President. If I recall correctly, the Costello committee was set up to look into this condition because we thought it existed. Is the gentleman in full accord with the views expressed by the President this morning? Has the gentleman been spanked?

Mr. COSTELLO. I will state to the gentleman I do not feel as though I had been spanked. I do not think the message was intended directly as a spanking. I think it was intended merely as an opportunity to present to the public the facts and figures concerning the Federal Government, which is something we have been trying to obtain for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state that the committee yesterday filed with the House a rather thorough report giving statistics on the Federal Government. I think it will bear out many of the contentions of the President that the question of deferments in the Federal Government is not too great a problem. But we have been anxious to get this information over a long period of time. We have been trying to find out who these 900,000 men of the ages of 18 to 37 in the Federal Government actually are, how they are classified, whether they are married and have dependents, and whether they are necessary. I believe the Review Board appointed by the President is going to see to it that those persons, particularly those single and nonfather persons in the Federal Government, who are not essential to the administration of the Government in its war effort, will definitely be inducted into the armed services in the very near future, and the Federal Government will be definitely cleaned out, leaving only those civilians who must of necessity remain.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has stated that persons deferred locally might have their cases reviewed in Washington if they are employed here. Is it not also true that if a person is registered in California and deferred in California and works in Pittsburgh that person's application would be reviewed by the Pittsburgh board where there is a war industry?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And that board might hold that he ought to be deferred,

whereas his local board would not agree to the deferment?

Mr. COSTELLO. The local board must grant the deferment first, it must agree to it, before the appeal board acts. On the question of occupational deferment the language of the bill states, "In case of occupational deferment," so that when a local board has granted an occupational deferment that occupational deferment is subject to a review by the appeal board in the area in which the man is working. If that appeal board feels that he should not have been deferred, then it reports that back to the local board, and the decision of the appeal board in the area in which the man works is binding upon the local board. The deferment then would be rejected. It would not mean that they would be able to commit the local board to give a deferment where the local board had refused a deferment. The out-of-State appeal board could only act under this provision when the deferment has been given by the local board initially.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill has five principal purposes. The first is to provide a revised appeal procedure in the case of occupational deferment of men employed outside the appeal area of registration. The next is to control the order of induction of men in accordance with the facts as to persons dependent upon them for support. Third, it centralizes the power and the responsibility with reference to the administration of the Selective Service System in the Director of Selective Service. Fourth, it provides a medical board to pass upon the physical standards of men for all branches of the service, and to be composed of a medical officer of the Army, one of the Navy, and three private practitioners of medicine, none of whom shall be in the employ of the Federal Government. Finally, it provides a machinery for preinduction physical examination.

Most unfortunately, the Senate did not see fit to pass the bill I offered last February which passed the House by a very considerable majority, and which would have provided an orderly procedure for the induction of men in accordance with the facts as to persons dependent upon them for support. There can be no doubt but that the House by an almost unanimous vote held that that should be the case, and that public opinion sustains it.

Subsequently, hearings were held in the Senate on a proposal to defer all fathers until January 1. I want to make it clear that I have never favored that proposal which was offered in the Senate. I have never favored any provision which would have arbitrarily and compulsorily deferred any portion of the men registered. I have taken the position that they should be called in an orderly manner, those with the fewer



obligations first, so that the families would be disrupted last.

Quite unfortunately, there has been an impression created throughout the Nation that the military commanders and the naval commanders have opposed legislation of this type. That is definitely an incorrect construction of the testimony of all of those who have appeared. In the hearings in the Senate committee General McNarney, the Deputy Chief of Staff; General Marshall, the Chief of Staff; and Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations and Commander of the Fleet; all testified on this subject. In each instance they made clear the fact that they insisted upon a definite number of men by the 1st of January 1944, that those men should possess certain physical qualifications, and, other than that, that it was up to the Manpower Commission to procure those men.

Therefore, the provision we have here cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as anything other than an orderly procedure to carry out what they would rather have. General Marshall said that if they are available he would much rather have men without families, particularly should they be worried about the condition of their families and their support while they are away in the service. So, this bill cannot be regarded as being contrary to the wishes of the military commanders.

A very important provision of this bill is the one which prevents the induction of men because of occupations in which they are engaged. Under this provision it will become impossible for Mr. McNutt, as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to issue his so-called nondeferable orders. I feel such orders have always been contrary to the law because of existing provisions of the statute to the effect that men should not be deferred because of occupations or by occupational groups. However, we placed it in this bill in plain language that they shall not be inducted by reason of the occupations in which they are engaged.

As to the centralization of authority, I want to say that there has been some confusion about that. In the original act, certain powers were delegated to the President. He was given the power, in the original act, to delegate any of the powers granted him to any official he might designate. Immediately upon the effective date of the Selective Service Act, the President delegated his powers under that act to the Director of Selective Service. Subsequently we passed the War Powers Act, and under that act the President rearranged his delegation of power and delegated those previously exercised by the Director of Selective Service to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who in turn delegated a portion of those powers to the Director of Selective Service. Therefore, the Military Affairs Committees of the House and of the Senate, have found that we have not been able to put our finger on the official who had authority to deal with occupational deferments or the matter of appeal; nor could we be

certain at any time where that authority should be vested. This bill sees to it that authority is centralized in the Director of Selective Service. He is the man charged with the responsibility; he is the one responsible to Congress for proper enforcement of the rules and regulations and the law.

There has been some question as to whether the present physical standards of the armed services are higher than reasonably necessary. That has arisen primarily from the fact that up until the Navy was required to secure its men through Selective Service, the physical standards of the Army were not quite as high, in some instances, as those of the Navy. When the Navy was required to take its men from the Selective Service, the Army increased some of its physical standards to those of the Navy. To what extent that may have caused physical deferments is not yet known. However, it has been regarded as in the interest of the conservation of manpower to see to it that an impartial board composed of two medical officers of the services and three independent physicians be set up so that they may review the physical requirements of the respective services and revise them as the facts may warrant, to the end that there may be no wastage of manpower.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement that there will be a standardizing of the requirements for the service. For instance, I have a constituent who attempted to enlist in the Navy. He was examined and rejected. He then was drafted into the Navy. He was examined and rejected. He then was drafted into the Army. He then went to the hospital, and he is now having difficulty in getting discharged because he is in neither one service nor the other. One service turned him down and the other service has taken him. Will this bill prevent things like that?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill defines the duties of this board, as follows:

who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed forces. The Commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established.

It will, therefore, be seen that we require that they establish these standards, and those heretofore deferred, because not meeting existing standards, are to be reexamined to determine whether they meet the new standards. We feel that this will go a long way toward eliminating some of the difficulties we have had in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. KILDAY. At this time, I would like to discuss section M of the present bill, which has for its purpose the adoption, in substance, of the Kilday bill, which we passed here in the spring. You will recall that under that bill categories were set up and the order in which men should be inducted provided. Under that bill it was provided that men with no dependents should come first; men with collateral dependents next; married men without children third; and finally, only, fathers of minor children.

It also provided that they should be inducted in that order on a State-wide basis. The present bill has been so drafted as to eliminate practically all of the technical objections brought forward by the Selective Service System as to the mechanics of its operation. The language here is believed to be sufficiently flexible that the difficulties of administration which were stressed at that time by the Selective Service System will be avoided.

However, instead of setting up categories as the former bill did, it provides that men shall be ordered to report to induction centers in such order that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers will be inducted after all other men not disqualified or deferred. So that it protects occupational deferments and does not relate to those physically disqualified. The original bill provided that it should be administered on a State-wide basis. This bill uses the language "on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and State-wide basis within the State." In the administration of the law, therefore, if there be a State in which all pre-Pearl Harbor fathers have been exhausted, and another State still has a supply, national drafts or requisitions shall be so arranged that a State with nothing left but fathers will have its quota diminished, and the one with a supply of men without dependents shall be increased. The same will be true within a State. Local boards which have exhausted all but pre-Pearl Harbor fathers will have their quotas reduced, while those still having a supply of men without children will have their quotas increased.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I do not have the bill before me and I am not quite familiar with the section numbers, but does the bill transfer jurisdiction over an applicant for occupational deferment to the board where he is at work, instead of leaving him under the jurisdiction of the board of his domicile?

Mr. KILDAY. Not exactly that. Section L of the bill provides that in a case where a man is registered in one appeal board area and is actually employed in another, if the board where he is registered but does not work, grants him occupational deferment, then within 10 days from the granting of that occupational deferment the matter shall be referred to the appeal board in the area in which he is working, for its determination as to whether or not he is occupying an essential position.



Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Well, is that necessary? That is objectionable to some of us I know, and I would like to know the reason for it.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe a proper study and understanding of the situation will eliminate those objections. We are holding the Director of Selective Service responsible for the elimination from industry of men not essential to those industries.

In carrying that out they have replacement tables and manning tables by which they determine positions which are essential and the order of their priority. Those are filed with the State Director of Selective Service and Training, and approved by him. Men are deferred or called in accordance with those manning tables.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Therefore, unless the board having jurisdiction of that industry has some orderly control over the manpower on that manning table, it cannot operate efficiently. As an example, the message from the President today sets up a system which exists under the Lodge-Maybank Act, which was passed sometime ago as to Federal employees. A Federal employee is not entitled to deferment unless the board within the Government has determined that he is essential, and shall have asked for his deferment.

In Washington, a Federal employee is not a glorified person, whereas in the communities a long way from Washington they may feel that he is the most important man in the entire Government service. The facts are there have been many deferments granted in those rural communities, in which the War Department or any other government department would not have asked for the deferment. Therefore, you cannot carry out the Lodge-Maybank Act unless you have some provision by which the people where the man is working are in a position to pass upon the facts of his particular case.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are many pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who have already been inducted into the armed services, who have two or three children, when there were many young men still available. Is there any relief granted to those men who have families with children, when there were young men in the State that could have been drafted?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill does not contain any such provision. It would constitute a disruption of the armed forces to do that now. You must charge that responsibility up to the other body who did not see fit to take action in proper time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I share the apprehension of the gentleman from North

Carolina [Mr. MORRISON] and a great many other Members from the report of the committee and the explanation of the bill, as to the wisdom of the first paragraph of the first section, depriving the local board of final jurisdiction with respect to a review in deferred cases. I should like to ask the gentleman, assuming that a local board has deferred a registrant, and that that case has been reviewed by the board in which he is employed—and I have in mind particularly war industries—my question is: Would the local board have the right to place that man in another class, in class I-A and order him to be inducted here?

Mr. KILDAY. I am very much afraid the entire difficulty stems from the fact—

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the answer to that question, if I may ask the gentleman? Would the local board notwithstanding the review and the deferment of the board in the area in which he is employed still have the right to reclassify him?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. The provision of this bill relates only to the case in which the local board grants him occupational deferment. If he is placed in class I-A that is not affected by this provision; the law remains as it is that the registrant would have the right to appeal within his own State set-up and his employer would have the right to appeal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand that. My question is this: Assume the local board defers him, that he is now deferred, but that the local board desires to reconsider his case and change his classification, if he is continued in deferment by the board where he is employed is the local board thereby deprived of power to reclassify him?

Mr. KILDAY. I think not; and I do not think the situation the gentleman pictures could ever arise under this provision, because if the local board puts him in I-A, then his appeal is in his own State and not in the State in which he is employed, because they put him in I-A. It would have to go through his own State set-up.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand that, but what about that case being reviewed subsequent to the deferment by the local board in the event the local board would like to reconsider and place him in another class?

Mr. KILDAY. That situation is not touched by this bill. It would be the same as it is now. There is no review now except from the local board to the board of appeals, to the State director, and to the President.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, as I understand it, the local board would be justified, irrespective of where he is employed, would of itself have power to reclassify him and put him in another class before they called fathers.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct, but if they grant him industrial deferment then the question would be submitted to the appeal board where he is employed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then they could reconsider and put him in another

class notwithstanding this provision for review.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. These two boards must concur before the deferment is continued, as I understand it.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And if they did not concur confusion would be caused and a disagreement. Where would be the ultimate decision between them if any?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me read from page 17, line 6, which controls that situation:

The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES].

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act, in the formulation of which it has been my privilege to share, contains three important provisions which I believe will prove tremendously valuable toward the solution of our increasingly critical military and civilian manpower problems.

First of these provisions is the addition of section 5 of the original act by which appeal boards are directed to review all deferments granted to individuals who are living and working outside the jurisdiction of the local draft board with which they are registered. The purpose of this provision will be immediately understood and appreciated when it is remembered that thousands and thousands of registrants have left their home communities, where they originally registered, to take wartime jobs across the State or even across the Nation. It is apparent that the local boards cannot possibly keep in personal touch with all these cases in a way to render invariably just and intelligent decisions upon requests for deferment.

In connection with the statement I just made, the special committee investigating draft deferments in the Government service and elsewhere made a report to this Congress on yesterday in which we stated that there were over 1,800,000 men on the Federal pay roll; that approximately 50 percent of those men, or over 900,000, were between the ages of 18 and 38. The Federal Government has requested the deferment of only a small percentage of those 900,000 men; I believe the figure is around 115,000; yet we find several hundred thousand men of draft age still on the public pay roll. Why is it? It must be and it is perfectly obvious, from the fact that many of them have been deferred on their own requests by their own local draft boards in States outside the District of Columbia. It is the hope of



this committee, therefore, that the first provision of this bill which makes it mandatory upon the appeals board here in the District of Columbia to review within 30 days all these deferments, that we take out of the Government service and put in the Army or the armed forces where they belong all these men who have been deferred not at the request of the Government but at their own request or the request of someone outside the service.

That fact has been strikingly demonstrated in the investigations which our special committee, for the study of draft practices, has been making. Right here in Federal departments and agencies we have found that a tremendous number of deferments have been granted by local boards merely upon the personal requests of individuals. This provision should effectively close the loophole through which great numbers of individuals are wrongfully avoiding service. It specifically directs in the cases of all individuals living and working outside the jurisdiction of the local boards with which they are registered that the appeal boards having jurisdiction over the immediate area shall promptly review all deferments.

Section 3 of this amendment amends section 10 (b) of the original act by specifically directing that the authority granted to the Executive of the Selective Training and Service Act shall be delegated to, and administered by the Director of Selective Service.

In that connection I call your attention to page 21, line 13, reading as follows:

The President is authorized and directed to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in him under this act (except sec. 9 or sec. 10 (a) (3)).

It was the intention of the subcommittee, consisting of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and myself, that this should include all authority except that specified and excepted in the act; yet, let me read it over today. It sounds as though we might be saying to the President, "You are directed to delegate any of the power you may deem advisable." I, therefore, want to make it clear that the Committee on Military Affairs intended by this language to direct the President to delegate all the power vested in him under this act except that power under sections 9 and 10 A-3.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Well, now, if that is the intention of the committee, certainly there should be an amendment offered. That is not the way this bill is written, as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana. First, the President is authorized to use his discretion and divest himself of any power vested in him in respect to this particular matter if and when he so desires. If the gentleman would strike out the word "authorized" in line 13, or better, strike out the word

"any" in line 14 and insert the word "all", then there would be no question. Why pass a statute when there is doubt among Members and the people who drew it as to what it means when it is so easy to make it clear?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I did not discover the language until this morning. I know what we intended to write in the act, and I make this statement in order that we may make a record, if the House deems advisable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming a local board in the District of Columbia takes a man off the deferred list that has been granted by his own local board in his home town.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The local board here cannot do that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I mean the appeal board. Assume it will take him off the deferred list, would it be mandatory on the local board to put him in class I-A.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Well, it would naturally follow.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would it be mandatory or could the local board still keep him on the deferred list?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The local board is powerful in itself except for rules and regulations made by the Director. They have the discretion in passing upon each individual case as to whether they will grant a deferment. Let us take a man who lives in Indiana and who is registered in one of the local boards in Indiana and working here in the Federal Government. He has been deferred by that board because of his employment. Under this act the appeal board here in the District of Columbia in 30 days would review that case. They might determine he was not essential and say that "We are going to cancel the deferment." It would then go back to the local board in Indiana. They still have the authority, and you cannot take it away from them, to pass upon his individual case, but the local board undoubtedly would not thereafter attempt to grant a deferment for this particular job.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But assuming they wished to grant a deferment, there is nothing mandatory in the bill itself compelling them to change it?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I believe the local board in such a case could not alter a specific decision rendered by an appeal board. The local board, however, would still have the lawful authority for other reasons to exercise jurisdiction and to render a new decision.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Assuming that this is reviewed in the district where the registrant is deferred in the first instance, and the local board approves his deferment. Assume that in the meantime the local board because of lack of registrants would like to change his classification. I ask the gentleman whether under the terms of section L

that local board notwithstanding the approval of the deferment by the review board where he is employed, would have the right before the expiration of his original deferment to change his classification?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it would not, at least upon the same set of facts and circumstances. This amendment specifically provides that the decision of the appeal board shall be final, unless set aside by the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I get one answer from one member of the committee and another answer from another member.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Is it not possible to define one man in the United States who can speak definitely as to those deferments? My observation has been that I cannot find out who does have the authority.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman mean to put it in the hands of the Director?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We have followed an entirely different philosophy in connection with the Selective Service. We have placed the responsibility in the hands of the local board where I think it should as nearly as practicable remain. As to putting the responsibility upon the Director of Selective Service for the administration of the act, that is what we do here. At least we intend to do it that way and I hope we may have some further discussion of the advisability of amending this section which I referred to and making the change as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan of the words "authorized" or "any."

There is another provision in this act which I want to briefly touch on, and that is the provision setting up a board of physicians. We have had a lot of complaint about the rejection of a number of men and the exemption of some because of physical and mental disabilities. There are a number of men physically fit and who could be used in combat service doing duties at home. We believe if this board is authorized and set up, one medical officer representing the Army, another medical officer representing the Navy, and three qualified civilian physicians, that they can determine a set of standards, rules, and regulations for all the armed forces as to the physical and mental requirements of those men who are to be taken into the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we believe if this board will function properly and as we intend it to function under this act, with the establishment of these standards and a review of these cases known as IV-F, that we can



take into the armed forces a number of men who are now avoiding service as a result of deferment and that they can replace many thousands of men who may be sent into combat service.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. From the study the gentleman has made of this legislation, does he feel that if the Selective Service boards would relinquish the thought that if a man does not pass certain mental tests, that is if a man is illiterate, if that provision were eliminated, would it not bring hundreds of thousands of men into the armed services?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. The gentleman may not understand that we are taking illiterates into the Army now. For example, a week or two ago I went through the reception center at Fort Benjamin Harrison and was told by the officers after visiting their schools where we are teaching men to read and write. I found also that every month we are turning over to the Army approximately 3,000 of these men who came in as illiterates and who can now read and write. There are less than 3 percent of the illiterates inducted that are finally rejected because they do not show sufficient aptitude, or measure up to the necessary standards of the armed forces.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Is the percentage of intake limited to the amount that the schools can handle?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I cannot answer that, but I am told that in Texas they have two or three schools. They have one, as I have stated, in the Fifth Service Command at Fort Benjamin Harrison. They are not taking all of the illiterates. It may be that there are not sufficient facilities to teach them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In regard to the boys rejected because of some physical disability that is more or less minor, what can be done to see that those individuals, if the Army cannot take them, are put in essential occupations? Businesses that are not essential can afford to pay them fabulous wages in order to get them.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. The gentleman is talking about something other than the Selective Service Act. He is getting back to the Paul McNutt theory of using the Selective Service Act as a means to put across the proposed National Service Act. You cannot, under the Selective Service Act, force those men who have been rejected because of physical disability into an essential job.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman thinks it should be amended to do so?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I do not believe you could do it that way. This deals principally with those registrants

who should be either in or out of the armed forces.

This simply means that one official, and only one, shall be responsible for the administration of the act. This provision, together with the very important further provision in paragraph (m), addition to section 5, should serve as unmistakably clear evidence that the Congress does not believe or expect the Selective Training and Service Act to be an adequate framework for a full-dress national manpower policy, which the administration has to date tried to make it by improvisation.

You will note that paragraph (m), mentioned above, specifically restates the original purpose of the Selective Service Act, namely, that draft eligibles shall be called into service in the order of their availability with respect to dependents, namely, first single men, then married men without dependents, and finally married men with children.

As further assurance that fathers shall be subject to call after all other classes, it is provided here that quotas for induction hereafter shall be based upon State and National levels. Notice that the committee has not undertaken to handicap the services by precluding fathers from service. It actually may be necessary, as the responsible military authorities have assured us, to call large numbers of fathers into service. All that is attempted by this provision is to insure that other classes of draft eligibles in all parts of the Nation are exhausted before fathers are taken. The evidence is plain that under present administration of the law that has not been the case to date.

Your committee is aware of the fact that this change from local to State and National levels will throw an additional administrative burden upon the Selective Service System, but we feel sure that the benefits which should accrue will much more than offset the added effort.

Of equal or greater importance is the fact that these two provisions together should do much to clear up the anomalous situation which has developed as a result of the administration's timid and vacillating attempts to hang its entire national manpower policy upon the limited framework of the Selective Training and Service Act. There is not now, and never has been, anything in this act to justify the arbitrary, contradictory, and confusing course the War Manpower Commission has followed from its inception. The provisions of this amendment should make it clear to the administration that this act was not, and is not designed for the purposes for which the War Manpower Commission tries to use it.

Also appearing as what your committee believes is an important addition is section 4, which adds a new subsection to section 10 of the original act. This sets up new machinery for the examination of the physical, mental, and moral requirements for the services. It is your committee's belief that there is vast potential military manpower in the classes of registrants heretofore disqualified for service. Hence this pro-

posal to establish a commission of five physicians to review this entire field of potential manpower, and to determine what percentage of this group of men may be made available, at least for limited service.

Every individual who may be lifted out of a disqualified classification will contribute by just that much to relieving the increasing pressure upon our military and civilian manpower. Every such individual, even though he eventually qualifies only for limited service, will ease the load on the Selective Service System, and will eventually release some man better qualified for a higher order of duty, probably with combat units.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I propose to offer an amendment which will vitiate the distinction now made in the committee print between post-Pearl Harbor fathers and pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Forty-two days hence we are going to observe the second anniversary of Pearl Harbor, and it may become, strangely enough, a significant and lingering date for generations to come in the lives of fathers. It will be the strange issue of whether or not they were wedded before the 8th of December 1941 or after that date.

The basic purpose of deferring fathers, as I understand, was to protect the home, to preserve parental guidance for children, to maintain the sanctity of that fellowship, the greatest social unit in our entire social structure, namely, the home; but that fact is entirely ignored in this bill. A man could be a pre-Pearl Harbor father with one child or a post-Pearl Harbor father with many children, but his draft status will be measured not by his home and children but by whether or not he was married before or after the 8th day of December 1941. His draft status is going to depend upon a contingency, and that contingency is that day in our calendar when Japanese aviators fell out of the sky over Hawaii. To me that is a rather singular kind of thing to set up in a bill, and I prefer not to do it.

The amazing thing is that a man has to maintain a bona fide family relationship under this bill, and yet here is this singular distinction as to whether or not the man was married on the 8th of December or before, or the 9th of December or after. Had it been predicated upon the effective date of the Selective Service Act in 1940 it would be a different thing, because then every able-bodied male citizen within a certain age range was put on notice by solemn notification from this Congress by means of an enactment signed by the President that he would be amenable to military service under that act. But there is no such logic in making a distinction between a man who is a father who was married before the 8th of December 1941 and one who was married after the 8th of December 1941.

We do not make that distinction in any other law. If you are a father it



does not make any difference when you married, you are entitled to a marital status under the income-tax laws of this Nation. It does not make any difference what your marriage date was, we make no such distinction for children. This bill states that the child of a father who was married after December 8, 1941, shall be treated differently from the child of a father who was married before the 7th of December 1941. We do not make that distinction in the income-tax laws because every child, irrespective of when the father was married, is entitled to an identic exemption or deduction under the laws of this country. We do not make that distinction in the Dependent's Allowances Act. What difference does it make on what day a soldier was married or a man was married? His widow, his wife, his other dependents, his children will fare exactly the same under the Allotment Act irrespective of the date on which the father was married. So frankly, in all good logic, I cannot understand that kind of a distinction.

You cannot rationalize it on the basis of the age, either. It is possible that a pre-Pearl Harbor father might be 23 years old and in the very pink of physical condition and have one child, as against a post-Pearl Harbor father who may conceivably have 3 children and who is 30 years of age, and probably a little spavined and ringboned and not in the best physical condition; but the young man under this bill would stay home and the older man would go.

I cannot rationalize that kind of a distinction at all. It makes it just a little bit capricious. I therefore propose to offer an amendment at the appropriate time that will strike out that distinction. If it is the family vine and fig tree we are going to protect, why determine on what date that vine and fig tree was planted? So that will be the substance of the amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How does a man know when he has a bona fide relationship with his wife and children? I am thinking of the cases of men—and there are plenty of such cases in this country—who habitually have to be sought out by the court and put into jail for not supporting their wives or their children. They certainly have enough of a bona fide relationship that the authorities keep haling them into court to put them in jail for not supporting their wives and children. Is that a bona fide relationship under this bill or is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It might or might not be. I think it is predicated entirely on the circumstances. But what I suppose is contemplated here is, first of all, a marital status, a husband and father who customarily and regularly supports his family and lives with that family. I would say you would rationalize it on an entirely common-sense basis.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Should not the law say so?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the language used in this bill is susceptible of that kind of rational interpretation that I think will bring about the objective the committee has in mind. But let us not permit a distinction to remain in this measure as between fathers who were married before December 8, 1941, and those who were married after that date because it is indefensible, illogical, and discriminatory.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I desire, in the few minutes that I have at my disposal, to discuss one of the provisions of this bill. That is the provision which appears on page 13 and which reads as follows:

*Provided, That no individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions.*

The purpose of this amendment is to nullify the so-called work-or-fight order which Mr. Paul V. McNutt, as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, promulgated on February 2 of this year. You will no doubt recall that when we passed the Selective Service Act we wrote into it a specific provision to the effect that men may be deferred because of dependency, and that they may be deferred from military or naval service because of their occupations, but at no time, either in that act or subsequently, did Congress make it possible to induct men into industry either directly or indirectly. Yet, Mr. McNutt has ordered that that be done. Under his order men now in occupations which Mr. McNutt calls nonessential must transfer to essential occupations under penalty of being inducted into the armed services, regardless of their dependents. That, I submit, is contrary to express law as enacted by Congress. In the Selective Service Act, as well as in an amendment thereto, we recognize dependency as a ground of deferment.

Mr. McNutt's order, completely nullifying dependency as a ground for deferment, is clearly in defiance of Congress.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the amendment proposed here in this bill take away or specifically state that the Director of the War Manpower Commission does not have the power to do that?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. That is the very purpose of this amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And was it not intended to make it plain and clear that he did not have the right to do it?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. There is no question whatever about that. Con-

gress never gave to anyone the power assumed by the McNutt decree. It is a clear usurpation of power. As an indication of the fact that Congress never intended that men should be inducted into the Service by occupational groups, I call attention to title II of the Family Allowance Act, which was an amendment to the Selective Service Act. In that amendment we provided as we had previously provided in the Selective Service Act, that no deferment from training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups, or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. Having said that men could not be deferred by occupational groups, and never having conferred the right or authority on any governmental agency to say that they could be inducted into industry by occupational groups, it should not be necessary to write into law the amendment to which I am referring. However, because of the open defiance by the War Manpower Commission we are in the position where we must again state our position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Since Mr. McNutt has made it plain that he intends to add from time to time to his list of non-essential industries and occupations men in all occupations not already designated as essential, are very much confused as to where they stand.

Since last February these men have not known what course to take. Both their homes and their business have been affected.

In some instances they would be compelled to close their business and have transferred to occupations where they are of doubtful value to the war effort.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I find a great many men who have a bona fide feeling that they should not leave their present occupation and go into a draft-exempt occupation, that it is not exactly patriotic.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Louisiana is correct. Undoubtedly, many men have been placed in that position.

Read the act from the beginning to the end and read the hearings and debates, and you will find that Congress had but one thought in mind in enacting the Selective Service Act, and that was to provide for the training and service of men in the armed forces of the Nation. Neither directly nor indirectly did we seek to call or authorize the calling of men for induction into industry or



agriculture. Despite this position of Congress, the Chairman of the Manpower Commission, on February 2, 1943, announced that all men in certain industries and occupations which he termed nonessential would have to transfer to essential war work by April 1 or be called for induction into the armed forces regardless of their dependency status. In other words, notwithstanding the plain mandate of Congress that dependency shall be a ground for deferment, the Manpower Commission, by bureaucratic edict, decided otherwise. So again Congress is confronted with the necessity of passing legislation to reaffirm its intentions, and one of the provisions of this bill is for the purpose of doing just that.

You will recall that when Congress enacted the original Selective Service Act, which became effective on September 16, 1940, the President was authorized to provide for the deferment of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which rendered their deferment advisable. Later Congress became more specific on the subject. In the amendment which became effective on June 23, 1942—title II of the Family Allowance Act—the President was authorized to provide for the "deferment from training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes." Title II as passed by the House specifically listed the categories in about the same order set forth in the Kilday bill, which passed this House by a substantial vote. Title II was amended in the Senate, and the general language just quoted was adopted in conference in lieu of the specific categories included in the House bill. This was not because of any intention to dispense with such categories, but under the belief that the language finally approved expressed the same thing. In this connection I would call your attention to the statement of the managers on the part of the House accompanying the conference report, which statement, in part, read:

The effect of these amendments is to make it clear that under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 it will be possible to carry out the policy expressed in the report of the House committee on H. R. 7119 to the effect that established families should be preserved so far as it is practicable and should not be indiscriminately uprooted. To this end these amendments authorized the deferment of men with wives and children until after the available single men have been inducted.

It is unnecessary, I believe, to point out that the Selective Service Act and all amendments thereto had to do entirely and solely with the selection of men for training and for service in the armed forces of the Nation. At no time did we seek to do otherwise. The title of the act itself is indicative of our intentions, namely, "To provide for the common defense by increasing the personnel of the armed forces of the United States and providing for its training." Nowhere is industry or agriculture even referred to except as provision is made to defer men from military training and service for

occupational reasons. As a safeguard against deferring any occupations or groups, regardless of the status of the individuals belonging thereto, we provided in section 5 (e) of the Selective Service Act that—

No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

If Congress provided against deferring groups of individuals it would necessarily follow, I submit, that Congress never intended that similar groups of individuals should be drafted for industry. While Congress made provision for deferring men for occupational reasons if their individual cases merited it, you will find nowhere any authority providing for the induction of men into industry or agriculture. Not having so provided it is obvious the order of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to which I have referred is without even the semblance of legal authority.

The order of the Manpower Commission completely abolished draft deferments for dependency as to individuals employed in certain industries and occupations. Even men with children were not excluded from the order. This, I submit, was clearly in violation of the Selective Service Act and the amendments thereto, particularly the amendment which provides for the deferment of men "who have wives or children or wives and children with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes."

Already we have seen the effect of this sweeping decree upon families and upon the business and the economic life of the Nation. As a consequence, men with dependents, regardless of the number, and regardless of their financial obligations, have been compelled to seek work in industries or occupations which Mr. McNutt has seen fit to label as essential and leave those industries and occupations he designates as nonessential. If work is not readily available these men must register with the United States Employment Service to be assigned anywhere or be subject to induction into the armed forces of the Nation. No provision, of course, has been made to suspend their financial obligations as was done in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act for those who enter the military service. Neither has provision been made for the transportation of men and their families from one area to another. Men inducted into the armed services begin at the same rate of pay, but men transferred to war plants may begin at any wage. The problems involved in carrying out Mr. McNutt's order have been as numerous as they have been complicated. I have merely touched upon some of them.

It is not difficult to understand the confusion which has existed among those who work in the industries and occupations, which might at any time be listed as nonessential. No one would think

of contending that some of the types of business and occupations listed by Mr. McNutt as nonessential are essential to the war effort, but that is entirely beside the point. Men working in such industries and occupations would under existing law be taken into the military service prior to those working in essential places. Certainly the power assumed by Mr. McNutt is more power than should be exercised by any man, unless Congress, after a full hearing, decides that circumstances warrant it. Certainly no circumstances can warrant this assumption of power to legislate. Men were not called for induction into the armed forces of the Nation until Congress said it should be done. If they must be drafted for industry it should be only when Congress so directs. As Congress has not directed that this be done, but it is being done under an unwarranted assumption of power, we apparently are in the position where we must reiterate our already clear position if we are to terminate such power. The passage of this bill, with the proviso to which I have referred, should accomplish it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, speaking on the subject of fathers and Selective Service, I am desirous of making my position known to the Members of this House and to my constituents in Montana. When I was in Washington 3½ months, I made the following statement during the debate on the Kilday bill, April 12, 1943:

I know that in Montana they have been taking married men and men with children for over a year, while here in the District of Columbia they are just beginning to take married men, and there are other large centers in the East where the same situation prevails.

I found out also that in some of the larger cities like New York there were still large reserves of eligible single men who had not as yet been called. As you know, it is my job to look after the interests of my district and State to the best of my ability in the National Capital. I have no sympathy for draft dodgers, whether they be single or married, because I feel that if this country is good enough to live in, it is good enough to defend. When Selective Service made its announcement about drafting fathers during the recess I wired General Hershey on August 5, 1943, for some information on the draft situation, as I do not like to make statements unless I can back them up. In his answer he informed me that there were 987,208 available nonfathers in the United States and that in Montana there were 3,089. This figure was for June 30, and for that date the estimated percent of militarily liable men in the armed forces was 31 percent for the United States and 33.6 percent for Montana, and that the percent inducted for the United States was 18.9 and for Montana 18.1 percent. This shows quite clearly that Montana, in this war as well as the last, is doing



its full share and a little more. I realize that no law can be absolutely perfect, but it is my considered opinion that the eligible single men from every State in the Union should have been taken before they started taking men with families. I realize that perhaps some men married to escape the draft, but certainly not all married men are draft dodgers and not all men who married since the war's start should be so classified. When you start to break up the home you are undermining one of the fundamental aspects of American life. If it is absolutely necessary to do so, then I am for it, but if there are inequalities I would like to see them ironed out first.

On September 20, after my return to Washington from the recess, I wrote General Hershey again for further information. My letter to Hershey and his reply of October 9 follow:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1943.

MAJ. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,  
Director, Selective Service System,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: This is in further reference to your telegram to me of August 14. At that time you stated that as of June 30 there was estimated to be 987,208 physically fit available nonfathers and 3,087 for Montana. I would appreciate it if you will send me the latest figures you have on the available number of nonfathers in the United States and in the State of Montana as of the present time.

I would also like to know the number of illiterates who have been rejected for service because of lack of education and what is being done to rectify this condition so that these otherwise physically fit single men could be inducted. Also, I would appreciate receiving information on the number or percentage of men with contagious diseases who are now being inducted, as well as the possibility or the probability of induction of physically fit members of the prison population of the United States.

Thank you very much for sending me this information.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

OCTOBER 9, 1943.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This is in reply to your letter of September 20, 1943, concerning information in regard to available nonfathers, illiteracy, and other subjects.

As of August 31, 1943, there were 614,882 available nonfathers in the United States and 1,865 in Montana as reported by our State directors. Some of these registrants would, of course, be rejected at the induction stations for failure to meet the physical standards established by the armed forces.

Relative to illiteracy, our data extend only to June 1, 1943, at which time our estimates disclose 120,000 physically fit illiterate registrants had been deferred from military service. On that date, illiteracy standards per se were discontinued at the armed forces induction station. Registrants began to be accepted at that time without limitation if they could pass mental capacity tests which were initiated in the induction stations regardless of whether or not they could read or write.

In regard to programs for illiterate registrants, this agency has attempted in the last 2 years to encourage a national approach to this problem.

Thus far there have been a few individual localities which have attempted to teach illiterate registrants to read and write, but no

Nation-wide program. However, on September 15, 1943, I directed all State directors of selective service to work with the chief State school officers of the States, and for local boards to work with local school systems in establishing classes for illiterates. At the same time the United States Commissioner of Education called upon the chief State school officers to attack this problem in cooperation with the components of this agency. It is too early at this time to determine what progress will be made.

Since June 1, 1943, when the armed forces changed from a policy of accepting only a certain percentage of illiterates each month, to the policy of inducting registrants who could not read or write provided they passed the mental-capacity tests, the Army has been giving special training to illiterates after they are in the armed forces and are teaching them to read and write.

In answer to your question concerning registrants with infectious diseases, a recent tabulation shows that of all registrants physically examined during June and July, and having venereal diseases as their principal defect, approximately 50 percent were inducted. Only 1 percent of those having other infectious diseases was inducted.

Special local boards have been set up in all penal or correctional institutions to process for induction registrants confined to such institutions who would be acceptable to the armed forces. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of the regulations covering this subject.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,  
Director.

It will be noted from General Hershey's reply that there is still a large number of available nonfathers, illiterates, and inmates of prisons who could be inducted and also that a substantial number of registrants with venereal diseases are now being taken into the armed forces.

This communication indicates to me that the Selective Service System is now doing a better job of inducting available registrants and is not too confined to technical restrictions as in past months. For this it is to be commended. However, I do think that more single, eligible men can and should be taken from the ranks of Government, industry, and professional athletics. These fields should be combed more closely so that the Selective Service System can be placed on a more definite and equitable schedule.

I am not here to defend the fathers—whose patriotism I do not question—but I am here to see if order cannot be brought out of chaos as far as the Selective Service System itself is concerned. For months and months heads of families have been kept in doubt as to their draft status; and, because of that, uncertainty and confusion have become the norm of these people who have their direct responsibilities to consider. The draft authorities have shifted one way and another and the men with the heaviest family responsibilities have been the victims. If these men are needed in the armed forces there is no reason for their blanket deferment. They should serve with the others. The Nation's security comes first. Provision has been made for dependents, and wives and children would not be left unprotected. The objection is not to the principle of drafting such of these men as are physically and otherwise fit but to the bungling, shift-

ing methods of going at it. It has been stated here in Washington that probably only about 1 man in 20 among the fathers would be drafted, which leaves a free-for-all guessing contest as to whom it would be. That statement also suggests that after all the need must be found. Included would be a national pool of childless husbands and reclassification of other men now deferred.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend in the RECORD at this point a resolution from the Butte Miners Union No. 1 of the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of Butte, Mont.:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1943.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has recently promulgated an order whereby all fathers of the Nation within draft age are to be inducted into the armed forces regardless of the number of their dependents; and

Whereas this order if put into effect will be very destructive to the morale of our Nation. It will be the means of breaking up countless thousands of American homes and with the break-up of the home, where is our vaunted American civilization? and

Whereas the work on the home front, manufacturing and producing the weapons and implements of war, producing the food to supply the armed forces and our allies across the seas is just as important to the prosecution of the war as is the work of the men on the fighting fronts; and

Whereas this work and all these functions should properly be relegated to the fathers of the Nation and to those having many minor dependents in order to avoid the destruction of the America home: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Butte Miners Union No. 1, do hereby protest this order of Director Lewis B. Hershey; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our Congress to pass the necessary legislation making void this destructive order and that copies of this resolution be sent to Director Hershey, to President Roosevelt and to our Senators and Congressman.

BUTTE MINERS UNION, NO. 1, OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MINE,  
MILL, AND SMELTER WORKERS, C. I. O.

At this point Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I include my remarks on the Kilday bill on the floor of this House on April 12, 1943:

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this debate today with a great deal of interest, and I heard one of the distinguished gentlemen from New York make the statement that this country had just about reached rock bottom insofar as its manpower is concerned. I wish to disagree with that gentleman and tell him that we have not by any means reached rock bottom as yet. We have a great many factories in this country that are overmanned. We note at the present time great migration from those factories back to the farms. We have something like 250,000 illiterates who have been rejected for the Army who could be used, who could be educated to the proper level for such purposes, the fourth grade. We have a great many people who are diseased in various ways who at the present time are being utilized by cures. We have men in the penitentiaries throughout the country who could be used and should be used in the defense of this United States.

Insofar as the Selective Service Act is concerned, nobody in this country knows what it stands for. Every day you read a different



directive from the Selective Service people. No one can make any plans. No one can look into the future.

As far as the Kilday bill is concerned, I am going to vote for it, but I wish it was on a national scale rather than on a State-wide scale.

Insofar as statements made today are concerned, that most of the draft boards throughout the country have done a very good job, that is true, but they are only human. They have to follow orders. Consequently many States have been drained of their single men long before others. For instance, the State of Montana, from which I come, I think was the first State to draft married men. That has been going on there for over a year. Here in Washington they are just beginning to draft married men. Some boards in this city have not yet begun to do so. Many of our large metropolitan centers have not yet begun to draft married men, and they should be made to conform with what the rest of the country has had to do.

This bill brings about equality and not exemption. We must remember that the family is the foundation of American life. If we do not try to preserve it as long as we possibly can, we are going to break down some of the foundations which we have considered necessary in the make-up of this country.

We should realize also that we do not have the manpower to spread all over the world. We will have to conserve some of our manpower here at home for the jobs that will be necessary to do.

I urge you all, therefore, if you can possibly see your way to do so, to support the Kilday bill, which is a step in the right direction.

As a veteran of the First World War—with my only two brothers serving in this one—I am keenly interested in this matter. All I seek is a square deal for everybody, not deferments for a few and responsibilities for the many.

I am convinced that the great majority of this Nation's fathers while not living in enthusiastic anticipation of their debuts in khaki or blue, will when called, take up their appointed tasks in the armed services of our country with the same gallantry and loyalty as has been displayed by so many of their childless comrades.

However, the statements that fathers should cheerfully ignore all the responsibilities of marriage, children, and home, and without further thought rush into military service in an all-embracing surge of patriotism, must certainly originate with those who have no such responsibilities or comprehension of them.

Today is our reality and there is no escape from it but the dreams and hopes of tomorrow belong to our children. It is not a trust to be lightly tossed aside and all the patriotic speeches made by Members of this Congress, newspaper commentators, and the like, will not dispel the real anxiety of the serviceman with dependents for the welfare of his family while he is engaged in securing the "four freedoms" for the rest of the world.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to attempt to get some information which I think is of importance to the Members of the House and to the country. I understand that the practice is being followed of somebody connected with the

Army, in effect taking boys who are attending medical schools, premedical schools, and other scientific schools, and putting them through what they call a screening process and then determining who is to be privileged to have the scientific education. When they so determine, then those persons whom they determine may have a scientific education, are immediately put on the Federal pay roll and they are educated at Federal expense. Possibly 5 years of college to be completed under that arrangement. I am asking the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] if he will be good enough to give us information with reference to that point.

Mr. COSTELLO. They are enrolled in these colleges as regular members of the armed services, either the Army or the Navy. However, that will last only for the period of the war or 6 months thereafter. At the end of the war they would be discharged from the armed forces, and the college education at Government expense would no longer continue. The purpose is to provide for a continuous supply of doctors and engineers in the event the war should last for a long period of years.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask again why it is that these boys are now at public expense being educated at a time when there is the heaviest draft upon the Treasury of the country and then when that draft is ended they will go off the Federal pay rolls? Has the gentleman any information with reference to that?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman's statement is correct. In other words, as long as they are in the armed services, assigned to the college, then they receive their uniforms, their housing, food, and clothing from the branch of the service in which they are enrolled. They also receive the pay of a soldier, \$50 a month. That continues as long as they remain in college. Many of those men are sent there for special courses, particularly engineering, and those courses may last only 2 months or 6 months, or it might be 1 year.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does it not contemplate sometimes lasting 5 years? Two years premedical and three years in college?

Mr. COSTELLO. In case of the medical student who is studying for an M. D., that is correct. It would be over a long period of years, although even the medical courses are being speeded up. Vacations are being eliminated and class hours are extended and the courses are speeded up very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This being in the armed forces as a medical student is just a front. He is not fighting anybody. He is just getting an education at public expense.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is quite correct. Of course, the Congress provided for this procedure and author-

ized both the War and Navy Departments to send those members of the armed services who are necessary, to go to colleges throughout the country to be educated at public expense, particularly in the fields of engineering and medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the discussion started by the gentleman from Texas in reference to students in colleges and universities. Can the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs tell me approximately how many members of the armed forces are in school and how many of that number have more than 2 years to go to complete their university work?

Mr. MAY. I do not have the figures exactly, but I understand there are six hundred-odd thousand students in the schools and colleges of the country; but as to the number who have 2 years to go I do not know. The greater part of them would be confined to engineering and medical students.

I should like to state this additional fact for the benefit of the gentleman who has the floor and the membership of the House; there is one thing that has not been disclosed: When we inducted into the military service men down to 18 years of age and those up to 45, which top age was later reduced by the President in an Executive order to 38, we just about closed up the schools of the country. The result was that small schools and colleges were going broke throughout the country, and in order to utilize their facilities and help them out the Army was authorized by the Congress to provide an educational training program, particularly as it related to these two groups, engineers and physicians.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the chairman's opinion that this was done as a relief measure for colleges and universities?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the gentleman's contention that it was the intent of Congress when this was originally done that it include individuals who had many years to go to school, who could not possibly render a contribution to the war within the near future? It is true the Congress wanted the colleges utilized in the war-training program, but the details of these programs have been in the hands of the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. MAY. The principal reason was to provide the necessary personnel for military purposes and especially in the medical profession, because there was a great shortage there. It applies mostly to medical students who had had 1 or 2 years in college, or who even before going to college announced an intention of becoming a medical student, or following medicine as a profession.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the chairman. I have one other thing I wish to mention: During my visit to my home State this summer I attended a certain Rotary Club. The speaker did not know who I was, but the speaker happened to be a



public relations officer of the WAC's. She was enthusiastic about her program. I hasten to say that I very much agree that these young ladies in the WAVES, the WAC's, the MARINES, the SPARS, and so on, are doing a splendid job and I believe we should use them wherever they can be used. But this speaker made the statement at that time—and that was back in July—that there were still 1,000,000 men in the Army doing desk work.

I realize that some of that desk work is work that should be done by someone with training, experience, and judgment along military lines. But I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, is that statement correct, that there are a million men in the Army doing desk work?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that quite naturally there must be a lot of desk work done by Army men, many of whom are not actually replaceable, for many of the questions to be dealt with and decided require the presence here in Washington of military officers and men of military training. Whether the figure reaches a million I do not know. An effort has been made to replace men doing purely clerical work, for example, with women. The War Department has been anxious to have two or three times as many WAC's as they now have, but for one reason or another they do not seem able to obtain as many women for the service as they would like and for that reason have not been in position to replace as many men as they want to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not suppose anybody can answer this question, but the country is disturbed over the fact there are 300,000 or more men of draft age and status in the Government service who have been deferred. I wish someone on this floor could tell me why we should defer any Government employee. I do not run across very many people down in the departments who are doing work that could not be done by men not of military age, and by women. I do not know why we have so many seemingly indispensable men in the Government. The people back home do not consider bureaucrats indispensable.

Mr. MAY. I may state to the gentleman that there are certain positions that cannot be filled by women; for instance, special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. There is a large group of men who have a definite background and training. They must be young men of the same character and caliber as the men who are enlisted in the services. You cannot replace them with women and you cannot replace them with older men. There is a peculiar type of occupation that is essential and irreplaceable. So far as the War and Navy Departments are concerned, you are bound to have people doing work that is peculiarly adaptable to men. In many positions of the Government people have had experience in handling the work and

it is such that you cannot gain this experience in less than 6 years. Such people necessarily should be deferred. All we can hope for is that no large group is being deferred who can be replaced easily.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, not a very great percentage of the 3,000,000 on the pay roll of the Roosevelt administration fall in the category of the F. B. I. The other bureaus and agencies have too many deferments. Some of these deferred men have not been employed by the Government more than 1 month. The only way we can relieve the manpower shortage is to discharge 1,000,000 Government pay rollers and let the armed forces, industry, and agriculture absorb them. There would still be 2,000,000 to be paid by the taxpayers. This would mean that two people would do the work that three are now doing. I think the people back home are stretching their manpower that far and the Government should do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in using these 5 minutes is simply to call further attention to the remarks that the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] made on the floor here today in respect to the conflict that exists in securing and training men for the merchant-marine service by reason of certain conflicts between the local boards on the seacoast, and I am expressing the hope that this whole matter may be worked out by the administration, as proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]. At one time I had given serious consideration to the possibility of offering an amendment, but I believe that the suggested course of the gentleman from California is eminently wise.

I have been in close touch with the United States Maritime Training Service since it was established by act of Congress in 1938. It was doing a good job in training personnel for our merchant marine before the war and was able, because organized, to increase its training facilities promptly to provide the necessary personnel to supplement available qualified experienced seamen to man our largely augmented wartime fleet. The training program is absolutely essential to the conduct of the war, and I believe that the administrative staff engaged in its operation is performing the same kind of service as those engaged in the training of the personnel of the armed services and should be deferred from induction so long as they are actively engaged in that work. This can be accomplished on its merits by administrative action of the Director of Selective Service, and I wish to go on record as recommending that this be done. To my knowledge the Maritime Service is using women and men not subject to induction for this work wherever practicable, and they can be obtained, but there are many positions which this type of personnel cannot fill

even if they can be found. The training program should not suffer for lack of the proper staff for its operation.

I was amazed to be confronted with many serious situations, including the following: A young man came to my office this summer wearing a blue uniform and said that he was about to be inducted into the Army, I think it was. I said, "What are you wearing a blue uniform for?" He said, "I have been taken into the merchant marine service, I have been accepted, and I am now on leave from the merchant marine training academy by reason of a telegram sent to me that I have been classified as I-A and must be inducted into the Army." So far as I could see he had qualified with the law for service in the merchant marine.

I called up and found out that the man had been accepted by the merchant marine. He had received about half his training as an officer of the United States, ready to go out in a very little while upon his ship. I wrote the authorities in Richmond and called them up. For some reason he had to go into the service. He was inducted. He had several months' training up here at Sheepshead Bay which, of course, was lost.

Boys were accepted for merchant marine training and from my limited knowledge of the law and procedure I felt them to be qualified in every respect for training and for service in the merchant marine, yet one boy was brought back after several months' training. The other boy was up for induction the last time I knew anything about the matter. There was still another boy in merchant marine training whom they just could not reach because he was training at sea.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have had the same experience. I may say to the gentleman in the case I have in mind the young man was taken out of the training school before he completed his course and sent to the Army. Under the present set-up that has been rectified, has it not?

Mr. BLAND. It has not been rectified yet, so far as I know. I have been having trouble. I met a boy out on the Great Lakes who had been trained. He was an ordinary seaman. Some technicality had risen about his qualifications and they were trying to get him drafted as I-A and put in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS. In those cases the Government loses all of the training previously given those men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before us this afternoon is to exhaust all possible sources of manpower before we begin to disrupt the American home by taking into the armed services fathers with dependents and adding unnecessarily to the long and fast-growing list of dependents to be



supported by the Government of the United States. I am sure that every Member of the House will support this bill as reasonable and proper legislation. I shall support it and vote for it.

I desire to offer an observation. The statement has been made on the floor today that an order has been issued by Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the Manpower Commission, to the effect that men who are employed in nonessential industries would have to leave those industries and go into an essential industry or face the threat of induction into the armed service of the United States. That order may possibly mean that a great many men eligible for military service would be frozen in what is termed essential industry when they may not be needed in that industry. About 2 weeks ago I received a letter from a very intelligent and substantial citizen in my district on a subject foreign to what we are discussing this afternoon, but he included in that letter one observation which I think is pertinent to the debate now taking place on this floor. I desire to read it for the benefit of the House. He states:

I should like to insert, somewhat parenthetically, too, that during the summer I worked at the aircraft building at the Ford Rouge plant. From my experience there, and the actual lack of work done, I am always inclined to write and tell the news commentators who cry about the shortage of manpower, and work not being done because of that alibi, that if they would don working clothes, go into the place where I worked, and spend their time seeing what is being done to slow production they would cease their cry and try to encourage the workmen to do their best. From conversations with many other employees in other plants I feel that where I worked is not an exception to the rule. What I have stated above is not confidential and can be supported by numerous incidents which I could relate if you desire to know some of them.

What we do here today is by no means a reflection upon the patriotism of fathers. Three weeks ago I visited an indoctrination center of the Navy located in New England. Twelve hundred men are at that post. I was informed while there that 80 percent of those men were married and 50 percent were fathers. Yet they had enlisted in the armed service of their country regardless of their responsibility back home and were ready and willing to do their duty. So what we do here today is in no way a reflection upon married men.

When the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] had the floor this morning, I asked him why it was that many men in industry, whether essential or nonessential, could not be replaced either by older men or by women. I wish somebody on the committee, particularly a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, which has charge of this bill, would answer that question if they have the information. What percentage of the people in industry eligible for military service could be replaced by older men or women? Is there anybody on the committee that can answer that question? If so, I yield at this time.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman I do not have any figures on

the subject, but by reason of the fact that all the industries are being placed on a replacement schedule basis, the men who can be replaced will be in due course of time replaced and only essential personnel in industry will be deferred.

Mr. DONDERO. That should be done.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make clear a point with regard to farm labor. The question has been raised whether or not the present bill modifies in any way the exemption granted to those engaged in agriculture. I call your attention to the fact that the Tydings amendment, which is subsection (k) of section 5 of the act now in force, was adopted as a part of Public Law 772 and provides as follows:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

The bill now under consideration makes an addition to section 5 adding subsections (l) and (m), which includes language in subsection (m) that indicates a change in the exemption for farm employment, the language in subsection (m) reading as follows:

Registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged . . . will be inducted.

Further in subsection (m) you will find the following qualifying phraseology:

Will be inducted after the induction of other registrants, not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act.

It happens that the Tydings amendment is one of the exemptions under that last language, so there is no intent by the committee or the drafters of this bill to modify the agricultural exemption. I thought it would be worth while to make that point clear at this time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these 2 minutes to ask a question of a member of the committee, and I should like to ask it of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], if I may.

In the committee discussion, did either of these questions come up? First, would boys in the last year of high school who come of draft age be taken during the first semester? My reason for asking that question is this: If they come of age in the second semester they are automatically deferred. It is a fact that if a man leaves college there is a very good chance of his going back after the war, but it is also a fact that if a boy is taken out of high school it is not

so likely that he will go back. It seems to me that thought might be given to that point.

Now may I ask the other question? I have had this question handed to me to ask. It is in connection with the merchant marine, as well as the draft. Have you thought of taking boys out of institutions, such as Preston and the like? I use that name because the gentleman from California will understand it to be a correctional school.

Mr. COSTELLO. I would state to the gentleman in reply to his first question that he is quite correct regarding that statement, namely, that only those high school students in the last half of any year of high school are deferred until they complete that final half of the scholastic year. If they are in the first half, they have only started a school year and so have not advanced so far as to lose a material part of a year of schooling. For that reason, it would seem unwise to allow them a complete year's deferment, because here is what will happen if you should do this. For every high school boy who is starting in a high school year whom you would defer until the end of the year, you would have to replace with a father. Hence it would mean a greater increase in the number of fathers to be inducted into the service if you were to grant the high school students just starting a scholastic year deferment for that full period of a year; whereas, if a student is already two-thirds of the way through the year, it seems reasonable you should allow him to have the extra month, 2 months, or 3 months that might be needed to complete that half of the final part of the year.

Regarding the other matter, we have not gone into that. There is some question as to whether you should take men out of correctional institutions and put them directly into the military service alongside of men already in service.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I should like to offer an amendment on a subject which I think has been bothering a lot of my colleagues, as well as myself, and that is the amendment to make a distinction in the drafting of married men who are under 30 years of age and those who are over 30 years of age. I think it is obvious that the committee dealing with the subject of selective service has had a great many problems to consider, and the members of the committee are to be commended, but I think it would create little difficulty for the Selective Service to make the distinction as to these two age groups. By the time he is 30 to 35 years of age, he is usually established in some business to the extent that his condition is a great deal different than if he were 20 to 25 years of age.

I recognize that it is certainly tragic to draft a married man 25 years of age with a family, but I do think the man who is 30 and over does have additional handicaps to become a soldier. He does



have the more difficulty to take himself away from his established business and his family ties.

My attention was directed the other day to a married man who is being drafted. He is 34 years of age and has one boy 14 years of age.

I think there is a great deal to be said for making a distinction between those under 30 years of age who are married and have a family and those over. Personally, I am hopeful that my colleagues of the House will agree with me on my amendment, because I think it is something that should have the attention of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What distinction would the gentleman make between those 30 and under and those over 30? Would the gentleman take those who are 30 years or under first and then later take those over 30?

Mr. O'HARA. I would take those under 30 years of age first and those over 30 after those men under 30 have been exhausted.

Mr. STEFAN. Without taking into consideration the number of children they have or the condition of their businesses, the gentleman merely makes a line of demarcation at 30 years of age, that those 30 or under should go first, and those over 30 afterward?

Mr. O'HARA. That is right.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LaFOLLETTE].

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I also think this bill should be amended in one respect. I discussed the matter briefly with the members of the committee, and we are not quite in agreement. I would like to see in this reexamination of the physical standards, a reexamination and investigation of the so-called emotional standard of rejection. I find a good deal of complaint in my country about people who are sent for induction, who apparently look all right, but at the induction center are completely relieved from military service on the theory that they would blow up if they got into war. They might blow up if they were shot at, but I do not think they would blow up if they were put behind a typewriter, or had to carry some sacks of flour on their backs. There is a good deal of criticism and I think the so-called emotional and psychiatric tests with which the country is being flooded are not necessarily sound, and that certainly a man should not be completely rejected upon the theory he is emotionally unbalanced.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(1) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located out-

side the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment under subsection (c) (2) or subsection (e) of this section existing at the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 30 days after such date, and any such occupational deferment made after the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 10 days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service, and such decision shall be made public. The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

"(m) Under such rules and regulations as the Director of Selective Service may prescribe, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this act, registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants, not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces. The term 'child' as used in this section means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild, adopted child, foster child, or a person who is in the relationship of child to the registrant, who became such prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: Page 18, line 14, insert a new paragraph:

"*Provided further*, That no married man maintaining a bona fide family relationship, as provided herein, who is more than 30 years of age at the time of the passage of this act, shall be inducted until such time as all eligible individuals between the ages of 18 and 30 years, inclusive, shall have been inducted."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes allotted to me because of my other remarks, but, briefly, the amendment states a distinction which I think should be made in the induction of married men. It is serious, in fact, to get down to the point where we are drafting married men, and I believe that the drafting of these men over 30 years of age, when the Army them-

selves say that even a single man over 30 years of age is not as good a man for service as a younger man, it is all the more serious as it means disrupting a family and taking away from that family the fathers over 30 years of age. I think it is obvious to all of us in everyday life, if we look at the people in our own communities, that they are more set in their businesses and professions, and in their family life after the age of 30 years. I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to decide somewhat along the line in respect to the provisions of my amendment, than it is for the War Department to dictate or for Selective Service to direct.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. I ask whether in the debate of the Selective Service Act last year it was not brought out definitely that men over 30 could not stand the rigors of war as well as men under 30.

Mr. O'HARA. That is my understanding, and for that reason I hope the House will see fit to adopt this amendment, so that we will have a distinction which I think should be made.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. First let me correct one statement that has just been made. I believe in the debate a year ago on the Selective Service Act, the point was made that men above 38 years of age were not able to stand the rigors of military duty as well as those under, and for that reason the age limit was lowered from 45 years to 38 years, at the request of the War Department. The distinction was not made at the age of 30.

The gentleman's amendment will make a distinction between fathers under 30 and fathers over 30 years of age. If you are going to offer an amendment to classify the fathers, as to how they shall be brought in, I do not think that should be made as to married men who are 30 years of age any more than you should make it as to a single man under 30 years of age. If any question should arise as to groups of fathers who may be deferred a little longer before taking others, I think it should depend rather upon the age of the family, or the children, rather than on the age of the fathers. The hardship would be no greater if the father is 30 or 35 and there are two children 3 and 4 years of age, than if the father is 24, and there are two children 3 and 4 years of age. For that reason, it seems to me that the amendment is not wise. The age of the father is no criterion. I do not think 30 is any proper dividing line in the physical ability of a father or nonfather as to whether they could stand the rigors of military combat.

Mr. ROLPH. Do I understand that men over 30 up to 38 years of age could stand the rigors of this war as well as men under 30 years of age?

Mr. COSTELLO. Practically as well as those who are less than 30. The War Department is using men of that age at the present time and is not complaining about it. They did find that when they



got to be older than 38 in a great number of cases, physically they could not stand up, and that a majority of them required hospitalization at the very beginning of their training and became a great burden and expense. For that reason they asked that the age be reduced. But, men between 30 and 38 are able to stand training at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman undertake to maintain that a man in his thirties can stand the rigors of military training and campaigning as well as a man in his twenties?

Mr. COSTELLO. Perhaps not to the same extent, but there is no great breakdown on the part of men between 30 and 38 undergoing the physical training required by the War Department of those men. However, when they get over 38 they find that generally the men are not in the same condition and are not able to take that training. Naturally, the younger man is going to be able to stand up a little better than a man who is 5 or 10 years older. But in view of the fact that we have not made this distinction between nonfathers over 30 and married men without children who are under 30, I see no justification for coming in now and making that distinction among fathers between those who are under 30 and those who are over 30, purely on an age basis, because that is not a real basis. If it is on the question of dependency, I think some distinction might properly be made, but I think we are only adding a little confusion to the legislation and only making it more difficult to administer.

Mr. MAHON. Theoretically speaking it would be better to take the younger married men than the older married men?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is quite true. That would be true in all these categories—singles, nonfathers, and fathers.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the first place, in other countries of the world do they not call up their men by ages, rather than by industries?

Mr. COSTELLO. Largely, wherever conscription has been in effect it has been done by the age group because persons have been called in at a particular age to take training. So, the calls are based on that age class in which they have taken their training.

Mrs. BOLTON. And we are the only ones who do not?

Mr. COSTELLO. Due to the fact that we do not have universal conscription in peacetime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Costello] has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I shall not take the full 5 minutes. I wanted to pursue this question a little further. If I may, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. Costello] whose subcommittee has been studying the manpower problem covered in this bill. This

question of ages was brought up in a very thoughtful letter which I received on the subject today, in which a constituent writes:

It seems to me that if our need for men in the armed forces is such that we must now call upon fathers closely approaching the 38-year deadline that before doing so we again open up a call for the single and married men without children at least up to the age of 40. What I am trying to say is while a father under the age of 30 may well make a good soldier, is a father 30, 33, 34, or 36 or 37, going to make as good or at least any better a soldier than a single man 38, 39, or 40?

I am wondering if the committee has given any consideration to the possibility of opening up the calling of single men or married men without children between the ages of 38 and 40.

Mr. COSTELLO. In view of the fact that the War Department has indicated that largely those over thirty-eight have turned out to be hospital cases rather than soldiers, they have been opposed to it. But it seems to me there should be no difficulty about the War Department accepting for service those men who would volunteer between thirty-eight and forty-five who are physically fit and appear to be capable of taking the rigorous training required for combat duty.

Mr. CASE. Was there any testimony offered as to whether or not men between thirty-eight and forty have been found acceptable for service physically?

Mr. COSTELLO. That question was not gone into at the time of the consideration of this amendment. That was gone into at the time the changes were made in the Draft Act, where we lowered the age to 18. At that time General Marshall did make representations to our committee that those above 38 did not prove satisfactory, but in the main were proving a very great burden financially, because of the medical attention they required.

Mr. CASE. Was that entirely on account of the age or was there some consideration given to the psychological state of the soldier if he had a large family that he was taken away from?

Mr. COSTELLO. Those things were brought up before the committee, and there is no question about it that when you start taking a father into the service, the concern and worry over his dependents, his wife and children, is a matter of great concern and it does militate against getting the most efficient service from that individual. That is the very reason why we increased the allotments that were made available to men in the service, so that at least from a financial standpoint the welfare of the family would be reasonably well taken care of.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman's remark calls to mind a phrase used in a letter which I received from an American Indian who is in the service. He wrote, "I cannot get anything in my head in the Army because I have too many things in my mind." It may be a rather peculiar way of putting it, yet it suggests the proposition. A great many of these fathers who are taken from their business and families, when they think that arrangements are not complete for their

care, find it difficult to apply themselves to the job of learning to be a soldier, so that their effectiveness is very greatly reduced.

Mr. COSTELLO. I might state to the gentleman that is the very reason why fathers have not been drafted heretofore. It is only because of the fact that we are getting down to the point where there are not available large groups of single persons or nonfathers that we come to the necessity of drafting fathers.

We did not want to do it merely because of the fact we felt they would not make as good soldiers as single men. This is why today we are confronted for the first time with the drafting of fathers on a large scale.

Mr. CASE. Summing it up then, the gentleman feels that the War Department's opposition to taking men between 38 and 40 does not make that a fruitful field for additional soldier material.

Mr. COSTELLO. Not as fruitful a field as taking fathers between 18 and 37, inclusive.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in one or two phrases in the gentleman's very clear statements that hitherto fathers had not been drafted. I think those of us who have had to answer the questions of fathers in our district who have been drafted would take a good deal of exception to that.

Mr. COSTELLO. I admit some fathers have been drafted into the service, but not on a large scale.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is on a rather large scale in some places, though possibly not so termed by the boards.

Mr. COSTELLO. The large-scale drafting of fathers is just now taking place.

Mrs. BOLTON. Also, the gentleman has stated that the psychological effect of family responsibility, and so forth, is greater in men over 30 than in men under 30, and has been taken into consideration to a degree. It would seem to me, therefore, that that in itself would be one reason for making the dividing line at such an age point.

I wish to ask the gentleman a very definite question with reference to officers' candidate schools: Are men over 30 now being accepted for training in officers' candidate schools?

Mr. COSTELLO. I believe so, but the number of men being accepted at the present time for officers' candidate schools is rather limited except in one or two branches. The need for officer training at the moment is not so very great, and for that reason the schools have been very considerably curtailed.

Mrs. BOLTON. I knew they had been curtailed but I understood the line of demarcation was pretty definitely set at the age of 30.

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know whether that is a fact or not. I believe some over 30 are being taken. I have not heard there was any definite regulation against their being selected.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.



The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 27, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 16, strike out all of lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and, on page 17, strike out lines 1 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a fair statement to say that need for men in the armed services has generally resulted in a reclassification by local boards and that those reclassifications have resulted in a change in classifications of those deferred for industry and agriculture so that those persons might be called before fathers.

Subsection (1) of section 1 provides a review of all deferments heretofore granted by the local boards for occupation by the review boards where the registrants are employed. It is my view that this impinges upon the authority of the local boards to change classifications at any time. Local boards are fundamental in the Selective Service; they are composed of local men who know the registrants, their characters, their occupations, and their qualifications as they are not known by those who reside in other States or other jurisdictions where the deferred registrants are employed.

In offering this amendment to strike out this subsection, may I say I have a high regard for the Committee on Military Affairs, its distinguished chairman, and the subcommittee that has carefully considered the bill under consideration. It is my view that the amendment I offer will strengthen rather than weaken the legislation and will promote the fundamental purpose of the legislation, to wit, to make more effective the Selective Service and to provide for the deferment of fathers.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment I shall be pleased to yield.

I am constrained to offer this amendment because of the contradictory interpretations that have been given to me by several members of the committee in response to questions I have previously propounded with respect to the subsection I propose to strike out. I understand that the striking out of subsection (1), which authorizes a review by appeal boards of deferred registrants made for occupational reasons by the boards in the State or location of the employment and not by the local board, will not impair the remainder of the bill.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment I shall be pleased to yield because the gentleman yielded to me. Suppose, for instance, that a foreign board—and I use that phrase with all due respect—

may declare, subject of course to appeal to the Director that the registrant shall be deferred, the decision is final and the local board now having the power to reclassify when there is demand for more men, including fathers, would be deprived of the power to reclassify before the expiration of the 6 months' period of deferment. Agricultural workers remain under the local boards. The local boards would have the power to reclassify agricultural workers, but not industrial workers in other areas—discrimination may result—the local board should pass on the deferment of all workers, and thus treat all alike. It is because this subsection undermines the power of the local boards fundamental in the Selective Service, the very foundation upon which the structure has been built, that I offer the amendment. It was said in support of the amendment that it would enable the boards in Washington to review the deferments that have been granted by boards in the local States. The boards in the local States have been progressing, they have been reviewing, and they have been withdrawing deferments. They know a lot more about what is going on in Washington now than they did 2 or 3 years ago or 6 months ago.

Whatever mistakes have been made, whatever discriminations there may be in the inductions or in the deferments under the Selective Service, have been made by the neighbors and by members of the local board who know the registrants, and their reputations and qualifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it was also stated that under the rules and regulations of the Selective Service, where the local board has made a deferment and wants to reclassify, now under the regulations, the appeal board in the place of employment would review rather than the local appeal boards. That is by regulation, if it be such, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to support any such legislation in derogation of the power and authority of the local boards.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman how he is going to reach the thousands of men who are eligible for military service now on the Government pay rolls and who enjoy a deferred status as a result of the deferments of their local boards outside the District of Columbia? The local board does not know about it. They do not know whether this man is essential in his Government job or not, but an appeal board here in the District will know that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I suggest to the gentleman that I answered that question in my initial statement. Reclassifications are being made of necessity and particularly where they have been deferred to work in shipyards and munition plants and come back home with reports that there are too many workers in such plants. They have been automatically reclassified. This would deprive the local board of that power. They are being reclassified by the local boards where they are employed in Washington. The chiefs of the bureaus here are being deprived of the power to request deferments from the local boards, and in my opinion that should reach the difficulty to which my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], for whom I have a high regard, has referred in advocacy of this subsection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. We have 900,000 men of draft age in the Government service. Only 115,000 of those men are deferred at the request of the Federal Government. But thousands of them are still on the pay roll. The Government did not ask for their deferment. The local boards have deferred them at their own request or for some other reason.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In my judgment, the local boards, rather than boards in Washington and rather than the boards in the area of defense plants where the pay rolls are being increased, would do a whole lot better job and would reclassify them a lot sooner than will the appeal boards in the districts of employment.

The armed forces are inducting more men. Many local boards are without quotas. Fathers are being inducted. As I have stated, the local boards are reclassifying. If it comes to inducting registrants employed in an essential industry or agriculture and inducting fathers, many boards will defer fathers. Personally I believe that fathers should be deferred before essential workers. I have always so advocated. Unless the subsection about which I am doubtful is eliminated, the boards in other States where deferred registrants are employed or in other parts of the same State where they are employed will review, and in industrial areas I predict that they will follow the requests of employers and continue the deferment. At the same time, agricultural workers will be reclassified. The local board will be deprived of power to reclassify industrial workers and at the same time have the power to reclassify agricultural workers. The industrial workers were deferred because of the requests of industrial employers in other jurisdictions. The appeal boards will be less likely to reconsider deferment where defense plants and shipyards are located than the local boards. The result will be that local boards without men must choose either between fathers and agricultural workers. When agricultural workers are reclassified and exhausted, to meet the quota fathers will be inducted. The purpose of the pending bill will therefore be defeated. I



therefore offered the amendment to protect the jurisdiction of local boards and to enable local boards to prevent discrimination and to promote the deferment of fathers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the language of the section that it is proposed should be stricken from the bill, namely, that—

Any occupational deferment made previously shall, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, and any occupational deferment made after the date of enactment shall, within 10 days, be submitted for review to a board of appeals in the area in which the registrant is employed.

The only purpose of that amendment is to say one thing; that is, that where a local board has already granted an occupational deferment, that occupational deferment shall be reviewed at the place in which the person is occupied or works. The appeal board there shall review it, and that appeal board can do one of two things—either say he is properly deferred because of his occupation or he is not. If they approve of the occupational deferment, the man retains his occupational-deferment classification and the local board is notified that it was correct; but if that board in the area where the man is working, investigating the job right there in that community, says that the work he is doing is not essential, that he should not be deferred, they reclassify him as I-A and notify the local board they were misinformed and that they made a mistake. That is all this section does.

You in no way take away the right of the local board. The local board still has the right to classify the individual registrant. Only when the local board gives an occupational deferment do the provisions of this section apply. It is only when deferment is granted, not when the deferment is refused. Under existing regulations, if a registrant is denied a deferment, he can then appeal from that decision of the local board, either to the appeal board of the State in which he resides or of the State in which he works. That is under existing regulations now. We are not interfering with that.

Here is something that you should keep in mind. In the Federal Government alone there are over 30,000 unofficial deferments. I repeat, 30,000 out of a known 115,000 deferments. How many unofficial deferments may exist in industry throughout the Nation we do not know; no one does; but we will come awfully close to finding out if the boards of appeal in the area in which those industries are located are called upon within 30 days after the passage of this amendment to review the occupational deferments of every out-of-State registrant who is working in that area. They will find out whether the local board has been fooled or not. Many of them may have been innocently fooled because the

registrant may have written and told them how important he was to the industry. The man may be sweeping up a plant and that is all, but, if he describes his job in sufficiently glowing terms, it will sound as if he is the only one man in all the world who can do the work in that particular plant which he is doing. He may never use the word "sweep" at all. It may be that he says he is recovering spare parts for reprocessing in an aircraft plant, but he may be recovering them by sweeping them up off the floor and throwing them into a scrap salvage bin. It is to overcome these unofficial deferments, not only in Government but in industry as well, that this amendment has been offered to the existing law, and I think it should be put in.

The present rules and regulations are not eliminated. Those unofficial deferments in industry, I think, this provision will eliminate; therefore it should be retained in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that under the language of subsection (1), which I propose to strike out, if the reviewing board in the other jurisdictions decides that the man should be continued on the deferred list, the local board is without power to change that until the expiration of the 6 months' period of deferment?

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know that they would not have the permission to reclassify him subsequently. Normally, when a deferment is granted, it is given for a limited period, 1 month, 2 months, or not in excess of 6 months, so it depends on the length of the period of deferment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But if he were classified for 6 months, then the local board would be deprived of any power, notwithstanding the need for additional men, to change that classification within the 6 months.

Mr. COSTELLO. I believe the gentleman is stating it correctly, and I think that should be true, because unless the individual does change his employment, unless he does change his type of work, if it is felt that he should be deferred, then definitely that deferment should take effect, but at the conclusion of that period the local board again has the right to classify him and can put him in I-A. When the local board does not defer, this question under this subsection would never arise.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] or the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. MAY]. There is a feature of this bill which I regard as very important, and about which I should like to vote intelligently, and that is with reference to a great many complaints I have had that many plants and industries are overstaffed, that there is a surplus of labor in these plants, and that

many of the men who have been deferred on account of working in industry are escaping the draft, although at the same time there is a shortage of manpower on the farms and elsewhere by reason of that fact. I want to vote for such legislation as will seek to correct and discover and protect that surplus of manpower, to reclassify these men if they are in plants where they are not needed. May I ask the chairman of the committee or someone else to instruct me how I may vote intelligently in this bill to do that one thing?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has asked for instructions and I shall proceed to give them to him. In order to accomplish exactly what the gentleman wants to do he should vote against the Whittington amendment and vote for the bill when it comes up for passage.

The situation is that this very section we have written into this bill and that is now under debate on the motion to strike will bring about that very situation and enable us to find out whether 1,000 men in an aircraft corporation in California who are being kept back there as a reserve supply of manpower, as was shown in the Baruch report and in the hearings on this bill in the joint sessions of the House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs, shall be kept on there or shall go into the Army.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I know the committee has had under consideration what I have been talking about because I have talked to the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee investigating this matter the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] and others on the committee several times. Is it the purpose of this particular section to try to correct that evil?

Mr. MAY. That is the aim of the section in particular.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does the chairman of the committee think that the section of the bill we are now considering is sufficient to correct the evil complained of, or is there anything more we can do to make it stronger to get results? The situation is intolerable and should be corrected, and the American people are demanding its correction.

Mr. MAY. If it could have been made any stronger I think my committee, after holding hearings on this subject, would have written something into the bill to make it stronger.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, may I ask him this question: Admitting that there are those who are in the way in the defense plants and in the shipyards, is it not more likely that the local boards where the additional registrants are needed to meet their quotas will be more nearly likely to reclassify than will the jurisdiction where the shipyards and defense plants are located, and where there is agitation and efforts are being made to get labor to come in from other sections of the country?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In reply to the gentleman's question I may say that I am not familiar enough with the formula by which this is carried out to



know, but personally I should like to let both boards act on it if necessary to try to get the results I am seeking to accomplish, that is, getting rid of this surplus manpower. If one board does not do it, I am in favor of letting the other board do it, or both of them. What I want is results.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I answer the gentleman from Mississippi by saying that as one who represents a district with thousands and thousands of persons from out of the State and out of the district, I can say definitely that you should have a local board in the area of employment review every single case, because I am sure there are a lot of them that are escaping.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman.

May I point out this fact. This is a highly technical situation that has had very careful consideration in the committee. I am very much afraid the amendment would defeat exactly what its proponent hopes to accomplish. At the present time every industry in the United States, and the Federal Government as well, are controlled by the program of replacement of those people who are subject to military service by those who would not be subject. It has been successful in the airplane industry so that today in that industry the employees are 45 percent women.

Every one of those industries has had to file its manning table with the State Director of Selective Service. It has been approved and is administered under the direction of the State Director of Selective Service. In the State of California, let us say, where the airplane industry is concentrated, you have all of the men registered within that State on the manning table compelled to enter the service, being replaced by those not qualified for military service. You are weakening the manning tables when you permit men to remain in that plant who are registered outside of the State of California and are not subject to the provisions of the manning table, even though their duties be nonessential. There is no means by which local boards located at a distance from the place of employment can determine whether or not their duties are essential.

What is your protection against that appeal board? That appeal board is operating on the cases of those registered with it and who are covered by the manning tables. They are constantly faced with the necessity for withdrawing from the industry in the State of California those registered in the State of California and working in those plants. All of the time that board is compelling persons registered under it to leave the airplane industry or whatever war plant it is, and enter the service. A worker from outside of the State working in the same plant is not so controlled, but he will be

under this bill. Therefore, instead of favoring the person working in that industry, that appeal board is going to be inclined in the opposite direction because every time it leaves that unnecessary out-of-State man in that industry, it is threatening to take one of its own people into the service and out of the industry in which he is employed.

You are overlooking the fact entirely that local boards do not have their quotas formulated on the number of men registered with the board. I claim that is wrong and have objected to it from the beginning. The quota is based not upon the number registered but upon the number registered with the local board and not deferred by it. Therefore, you are defeating the very purpose you are attempting to accomplish because it is those centers of population which furnish the vast numbers of industrial workers. By increasing their occupational deferments those local boards can diminish their pool of available men under the Draft Act. So long as you leave the matter as it now stands, those local boards can reduce their inductions by increasing their occupational deferments, which are not subject to investigation. With the adoption of the proposal in this bill, you accomplish what you want. If you adopt the amendment, you do not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In answer to the gentleman, I would say—

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, I did not yield for a statement. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the industrial areas from which the labor solicitors come would more nearly speak the language of this appeal board as to the need for these men than would the areas where these laborers are to be taken?

Mr. KILDAY. That is the gentleman's argument. I do not think it is a very sound one from the experience of the act.

Mr. WALTER. What sets in motion the function of the appeal board?

Mr. KILDAY. It is automatic. Those at present holding industrial deferments are to have their cases submitted to the appeal board within 30 days and those hereafter granted shall be submitted within 10 days.

Mr. WALTER. Who submits the case?

Mr. KILDAY. It will be submitted by the Selective Service System.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this provision in the proposed law. It is one that has been given a great deal of study and attention. I believe the trouble that has arisen today is due perhaps to the confusion that lies in the minds of some as to what is being done by this provision in this bill. This provision does not invade the jurisdiction of the local boards. It still preserves the original law which gives the local boards authority to pass judgment on questions of deferment. It permits a man subject to draft to go in to a

local board, and submit his case to that local board, and let the local board pass judgment on whether or not he should be deferred. If he is an agricultural worker, that local board still has exclusive authority to pass judgment on whether or not he should be given agricultural deferment. No one else has that authority. That local board retains jurisdiction over that individual case until that man leaves that locality and goes to some distant point. I submit to you that when a man leaves Louisiana and goes to Washington State to work for occupational purposes, he has left the jurisdiction of the local board in Louisiana. It is a question of proof. A man who goes to Washington State with an occupational deferment given by local draft board, in doing this moves his occupational jurisdiction to Washington State where he is working. When he is in Washington State—I am just using Washington State for the purpose of this illustration—the matter to be presented to the board of appeals in Washington State is merely one of what is the nature and type of his occupation. That is the proof that can only be obtained by the board of appeals where the man is working, not by the local board of his former occupational residence in Louisiana. Therefore, if you want a thorough investigation of cases of deferment, you must go to the board of appeals where the man really works—the board that receives the information first-hand from the company or the industry asking for his occupational deferment. That board has the facilities in that local area to go out personally and investigate that industry, that occupation, and determine first-hand as to whether or not it is proper to continue the deferment given to the individual.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me cases where there is severe censure against certain industries because of so many occupationally deferred employees—men who have been brought into an area from many parts of the United States, from many local draft boards. The only way to determine how many are occupationally deferred by a certain company or a certain industry is to give the local appeal boards jurisdiction to take each one of those occupationally deferred cases and pass judgment on them.

I asked the committee, when this bill was before us, to include in this particular provision a stipulation that the findings of the boards of appeal shall be made public. I wanted it to be included for the purpose of showing local people how many deferments are being given to this industry or to that industry, or to this plant or to that plant. I think the pressure of local opinion which demands fair administration of this act will require that boards of appeal, which have to publish their decisions, be fair about granting occupational deferments in the cases before it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.



I want to make this observation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and others who have spoken in behalf of this amendment: If you are interested in delaying the drafting of fathers until other categories, single men and married men without children, are inducted, you should vote against this amendment, because this amendment is the strongest part of the bill to delay the drafting of fathers by forcing into the service those men who are now enjoying erroneous or unwarranted deferments not only in Government service but in industry.

The gentleman from Texas a few moments ago stated that he had complaints from his district and from people in his State that there was a hoarding of manpower. If you strike out this section, you will have no way of reaching those men who are erroneously deferred in industry and in the Government. The appeal board in the locality where the man is employed knows more about whether that man is essential in that industry than does the local board that may be 3,000 miles away.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true that thousands who have been erroneously deferred were deferred by the local boards?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. THOMASON. And this committee, after exhaustive hearings, found that this was the only way to meet that situation?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. THOMASON. In that same connection, is it not true that as far as agricultural workers are concerned, they are taken care of by the law itself?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. This section of the bill applies to those men who have left the jurisdiction of their boards and are working in other jurisdictions, perhaps many thousand miles away.

This has been one of the most perplexing problems that the committee has had to deal with, the question of unwarranted or erroneous deferments. We have tried every way possible to reach those men in industry and in the Government service who should not be deferred. If you strike out this section you will defeat the very thing you are trying to do, that is, delay the drafting of fathers until the single men and married men without children have been taken into the service.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. As one who knows something about this subject, having one of those districts which has a great deal of employment, I will say the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] are absolutely correct in their statements, and this is the most important step that can be taken for the deferment of the drafting of fathers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Now, to erase from your minds any doubt about whether this bill takes away from an individual his right of appeal, it does not. As an example, if a man from North Carolina is employed in Baltimore in an aviation plant, with an occupational deferment from his local board, the reviewing board in Baltimore should determine whether he is essential in that plant.

A review board might revoke his deferment and notify the local board that the deferment was erroneously granted. The local board would then in all probability classify him I-A, but the man still has the right to appeal from that new classification to his local appeals board.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. MAY. The only thing involved here, of course, is to determine whether or not a local draft board back in some State knows more about what a man is doing and whether he is in an essential job in a distant State than the people in the community where he is working.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, the local boards should pass upon the men living and working in the jurisdiction of that board; but when a man leaves the jurisdiction of his local board and goes to some other State, then I think the appeals board in the State where the man is working will know more about the essentiality of that employee than the local board perhaps a thousand miles away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 17, line 18, strike out the word "were" and insert the word "are"; in line 19, strike out the words "prior to December 8, 1941" and insert the word "and."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the discussion on drafting fathers had reached its maximum temperature some weeks ago I believe the most effective argument that was made was that there was a waste of manpower in industry, that there was a surplus of eligible material apparent on the Federal pay roll and that there were a number of unencumbered individuals in the country who should first be called, and that thereafter fathers should be taken.

The Committee on Military Affairs has done a very creditable job in that direction. Here is an appeals section in the pending measure that will get at some of these indefensible deferments in industry. Here is another provision to set up a lay commission for the reexamination of the physical standards of the Army. Here is a provision that will get at the deferments on the Federal pay roll. The committee in a sense has said that we will get at all those eligibles first and then we will put the fathers at the tail

end of the procession. That would have been the logical thing to do, but the committee did not go quite that far; they said: "We will put only some of the fathers at the end of the procession." My amendment proposes to put all fathers at the tail end of the procession by striking out a wholly illogical differentiation between fathers who were married before Pearl Harbor and those who were married after Pearl Harbor. After all, a home is a home. What difference does it make if the father was married on the 9th of December or on the 7th of December, 1941? A child is a child. What difference does it make whether the father of that child was married and this union was consummated on the 7th of December, 1941, or consummated on the 9th of December, 1941? The whole purpose for deferring fathers and putting them at the tail end of the procession of those who shall ultimately go into the military service is for the purpose of preserving the home, perpetuating the family unit; that is the basis. What the committee did was to say that they would put part of the fathers, those who were married before Pearl Harbor, at the tail end of the procession, that they should be inducted last, but no corresponding exemption was made for the fathers who were married after Pearl Harbor. The children of the fathers married after Pearl Harbor would be of a more tender age and might need even more the parental guidance and the presence of a father in the home than those whose children are older, because there is provision here that the child may be up to 18 years of age before the deferment passes. So I put it to you on the theory that this is an illogical distinction. We did not make it in the income-tax law. A child is a child and worth \$350 of the taxpayer's money. We make no distinction as to whether a man was married on the 7th or 9th of December to get the deduction for a marital status. In exactly the same way you made no such distinction in the Dependents' Allowances Act: A child is a child, a dependent a dependent, a wife a wife, irrespective of whether that union was consummated on the 7th of December or on the 9th of December.

Why perpetuate this kind of illogical distinction in the law? Let us do this thing right. We are going to get at those who are on the Federal pay roll and have been deferred; we are going to get after those in industry who may live in one State under the jurisdiction of a local draft board and be working in another State; we are going to provide a commission for a study of the physical requirements for military service to make certain that all able-bodied persons within the age brackets will be made available for service. This bill will be a substantial answer to the frequent charges made that industry is hoarding manpower, the Federal rolls are harboring military talent, and that unencumbered men are being deferred for minor defects. To that extent, the bill is a creditable piece of work. Let us not now make the mistake of deferring only a part of the fathers until all other avail-



ables have been reached only because they were wed before or after a certain date. Why not think of the home and family as such without regard to the date on which a home and family came into existence and give to all families the benefit of this legislation. If the distinction were based upon the Draft Act of 1940 it would be a different matter. When that act was passed it was notice to every military eligible in the country that he might be called; but certainly pre-Pearl Harbor was no notice to anybody, and so why such a discrimination in the act? Let us adopt this amendment and eliminate it and say that fathers, pre-Pearl Harbor and post-Pearl Harbor alike shall come at the tail end of the procession after the long arm of the selective service has reached into industry, into the Federal Government, and found available manpower that can very well go into the armed services.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The implication of the date December 7, 1941, is that those who married after that date did so in order to become deferred as married people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There may be many who probably have taken advantage of October 1940, when the Draft Act became effective in the country, rather than the date of Pearl Harbor. The damage was done several years before, or at least 1 year before. While there may have been some people who rushed into wedlock the day after Pearl Harbor, it would be a small proportion of the total, so why penalize the good, upright, sincere, earnest father who probably had all the reason in the world to consummate wedlock, and place this stigma on him that will attend these fathers all the days of their lives? It will not be for next week, next month or next year. Twenty-five years hence, the stigma will still be there. They were either post-Pearl Harbor or pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

Mr. KLEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman's amendment speaks only of the date of the marriage. It says nothing about a definition of "child" on page 10.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have another amendment which I will offer.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am wondering if the gentleman's amendment would not encourage them to rush into wedlock from now on?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would have no such effect whatsoever. We are dealing here with a wholly artificial distinction between a father who was married before December 8, 1941, and one who was married after that date, and in so doing we are entirely forgetting the real issue that is involved, namely, the children and the

home. The bill itself requires a bona fide family relationship with children under 18 in the case of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. And then it proceeds to ignore that relationship entirely in the case of post-Pearl Harbor fathers. I should like to hear some member of the committee defend that provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 58, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: On page 18, line 14, insert a new paragraph:

"Provided further, That no married man maintaining a bona fide family relationship as provided herein, who is more than 32 years of age at the time of the passage of this act, shall be inducted until such time as all eligible individuals between the ages of 18 and 32 years, inclusive, shall have been inducted."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, this is in substance the same amendment that was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]. I regret exceedingly I was out of the Chamber when the gentleman offered it. His age limitation was set at 30 years. In order to renew the proposition I am merely changing the age limit to 32.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the pending bill. I think it is constructive legislation. But when the Selective Service actually reaches the bottom of the barrel and begins to induct fathers with children into the service the draft boards will reach out and take the fathers regardless of whether they are 18 or 38 years of age. That just does not make sense to me for a number of reasons.

First, if we can help, we do not want those fathers who are over 32 years of age in combat service, in the Infantry, in the Artillery, in the Air Force, in the Tank Corps, or, in fact, in any part of the combat service. But the draft boards under the law we are about to pass would have to take the married men with children of 38 just the same as they would take the married man with children of 28 or 18.

My amendment is offered on a non-partisan basis. The bill itself is non-partisan. Therefore, I am asking the Members to consider this amendment solely on the basis of its merit. Every one of us knows very well, because we are concerned with our constituents back home, whether he be Republican or Democrat, that men of 32 and older, who are married, have more children than do the younger men. They have been engaged in business for a long time and they are apt to have their entire business efforts of 10 or 15 years' hard work wiped out by being drafted into the armed forces. I submit, let us put married men 32 to 38, with children, in the last category so they will not have the fear hanging over them all the time that the long arm of the draft board will

reach out and pluck them away from their business and families. I offer this as a completely nonpartisan proposition on its merits because, first, I do not think we need these older men of 32 and upward. Certainly they are not needed in the Army until the younger men are absorbed. Second, because it is a great hardship to all these married men over 32 years, with children, who are in business and have large families. Why not put them at the bottom of the barrel by this simple amendment making the age 32 so that when the fathers with children are called the draft boards will take those up to 32 first and those above 32 last? It does not change the bill in any other respect.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. The gentleman's amendment would discriminate, does he not think, against thousands of men who are in the services and who are over 32 years of age?

Mr. FISH. There have been very few married men with children drafted up to now. I am concerned with the millions who are not in the service. We are talking in this bill about the future and what will happen in the future.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think he is also discriminating against the married men without children who are beyond 32 years of age?

Mr. FISH. I am talking about married men with children. There is where the hardship lies. Congress has already determined by law that a married man without a child should be drafted and I am for drafting them ahead of married men with children. My amendment simply has to do with married men with children and it puts those above 32 years at the very end of the eligibles. It is in the best interest of the military service, and in fairness to those who are in business and have families to support and bring up, I ask that the amendment be adopted. If my amendment is sound and meritorious it ought to be adopted. If it is not, it should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 24, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 10 (a) (2) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"To create and establish a Selective Service System, and shall provide for the classification of registrants and of persons who volunteer for induction under this act on the basis of availability for training and service, and shall establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. There shall be created one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia.



Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President, from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials. No member of any such local board shall be a member of the land or naval forces of the United States, but each member of any such local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction under rules and regulations prescribed by the President. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service as provided in the last sentence of section 5 (1) of this act. No person who is an officer, member, agent, or employee of the Selective Service System, or of any such local or appeal board or other agency, shall be excepted from registration, or deferred from training and service, as provided for in this act, by reason of his status as such officer, member, agent, or employee."

(b) Section 10 (a) (3) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and fix the compensation at a rate not in excess of \$10,000 per annum, a Director of Selective Service who shall be directly responsible to him and to appoint and fix the compensation of such other officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or of any reserve component thereof or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to sec. 10 (a) (2)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States: *Provided further*, That any person so appointed, assigned, or detailed to a position the compensation in respect of which is at a rate in excess of \$5,000 per annum shall be appointed, assigned, or detailed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Director of Selective Service may appoint necessary clerical and stenographic employees for local boards and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without regard to the provisions of civil-service laws."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 21, line 9, after the word "amended", strike out the comma, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of line 9 and all of line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Section 10 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The President is authorized and directed to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in him under this act (except sec. 9 or sec. 10 (a) (3)). The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 21, line 14, strike out "any" and insert in its stead "all."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I discussed this provision of the bill and this particular language. It was the intention of the subcommittee and the full committee when this bill was reported that the President be directed to delegate to the Director all of the authority given him under the Selective Service Act except that part of it specifically excepted in the section. As it is written with the word "any" there is some doubt as to whether it means all authority or a part of such authority. In order to resolve that doubt and have a definite understanding as to what we mean, I offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. Section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In order to assist in the determination of whether or not men should be deferred from training and service because they are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective, and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President is authorized and directed forthwith to appoint a commission of five qualified physicians, of whom one only shall be an Army officer and one only a Navy officer, and the three remaining members shall be qualified civilian physicians not employed by the Federal Government, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 22, line 17, after "men", insert a comma and the following: "including those previously discharged from the armed services because of physical disability."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this brief explanation of the

amendment. There have been discharged from the military service for various reasons about 550,000 men, many of whom are probably capable of very active military duty. The only thing this amendment proposes is that they be reexamined and reclassified. That is all it does.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. No time is specified here as to when this work shall be completed.

Mr. MAY. The assumption is that they will go at it as soon as this law is passed, as expeditiously as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAFOLLETTE: On page 22, line 2, after the comma following the word "mentally", insert the word "emotionally." Also, on page 22, line 9, after the word "physical", insert the words "and emotional."

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of reconsidering as well as we can the so-called psychiatric examinations which have been made of inductees. Having served in the last war and seen some of the men who came out of it, I am very well aware of the fact that there are men who are so emotionally constituted that they cannot stand up under gunfire, we will say. But I have observed, and I think it is true, that there has been no induction for any limited service of men who were considered to be emotionally unbalanced. To me, it is incredible that a man, who might not be able to stand up under the pressure of gun fire, could not serve behind a typewriter, or could not serve as a guard for prisoners. Prisoners do not have guns, and they cannot hurt you very much without them.

I think you will find that a great deal of the reason for the morale of the people being adversely affected by the operation of the Selective Service Act is that people feel that too often men have been declared unfit for any kind of military service purely because some psychiatrist says, "You are emotionally unbalanced." Some of these men rather boast of the fact that they are out. "I am crazy," they say. It is one of the few situations where I have seen people who seem to be proud of the fact that they are crazy.

This section calls for a reexamination of the standards by which we have been rejecting people for physical causes. I think it is proper to include in this direction a reexamination of the standards by which we have been rejecting them completely for so-called mental causes. I believe it is fair for me to say that the committee possibly thinks there is a good deal that is wrong with this psychiatric problem, but that my amendment would weaken their language. I do not believe it would. Certainly this question of emotional balance is not physical. If it were physical, we would not have all



these psychiatrists and other people hanging around induction centers.

Further, there is a definite difference between psychology, which is a science, and psychiatry, which today to the minds of many psychologists is simply a form of voodooism or exploring into the unknown. Professor Link, who has written *The Return to Religion* and is one of the outstanding psychologists in America, very ably points out the difference between the science of psychology and the immature development of the thing we call psychiatry and which I refuse to dignify as a science.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. I do not believe it will weaken the bill. I think you will get a good deal of response from the country if you will re-examine this so-called psychiatric rejection of people for all purposes. I think a man who handles shoes or clothing in civilian life can certainly find a place somewhere in the Quartermaster Corps, where he will not be frightened by bullets but where he can still render a service, and get somebody else into the Army from a farm somewhere who has enough guts to go in and fight.

It has been my observation that very few hard-working people, either from the city or the farm, have been excused from military service by these psychiatrists.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LaFollette].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LaFollette) there were—ayes 30, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Any registrant within the categories herein defined when it appears that his induction will shortly occur shall, upon request, be ordered by his local board in accordance with schedules authorized by the Secretary of War and Director of Selective Service, to any regularly established induction station for a preinduction physical examination.

The commanding officer of such induction station where such physical examination is conducted under this provision shall issue to the registrant a certificate showing his physical fitness or lack thereof, and this examination shall be accepted by the local board. Those registrants who are classified as I-A at the time of such physical examination and who are found physically qualified for military service as a result thereof, shall remain so classified and report for induction in regular order.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 23, line 9, after the word "order", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

"Provided further, (a) That any person subject to training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and the Selective Service Regulations may, at any time prior to being placed in class I-A, apply to the induction station nearest his place of residence for an examination to determine his physical fitness for such training and service. Such examination shall be given any applicant within 60 days after the receipt of his application.

"(b) If any person fails to pass the examination given him under the provisions of section 1, such fact shall be immediately communicated to his local draft board, and such board shall thereupon place such person in class IV-F. If any person passes such examination, such fact shall not affect his status under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and the Selective Service Regulations, nor advance the time of his induction for training and service."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the whole question before the House today revolves itself around the question of manpower. My amendment is offered only because of my personal experience as a member of a local selective service board, before becoming a Member of this House. Men are sent to the induction center, who have sold their furniture, broken up their homes, and sold their businesses, and put to a great deal of hardship and embarrassment because after they reached the induction center they were rejected. I know one man who was a member of a distinguished law firm in the city of Chicago, who distributed all of his law business. His friends gave a party for him, showered him with gifts, and gave him a great send-off. He was rejected, and to this day he has not been able to go back and face his former associates. That is one side of the picture. The other side takes in industry and our war production. A man applies to a defense plant for work, and the first question he is asked is this: What is your standing in your local draft board? As soon as they find out the man might be subject to induction, they cannot afford to give him employment, and spend 3 or 4 months of time and money training that man, just to have him inducted into the Army. Whereas, if this amendment be adopted and enacted into law, that man can go to the induction center, and upon his request to the local service board, have his examination, and it can then be determined whether he would be I-A or IV-F. If he is IV-F then he can go to the defense plant and apply for employment, and in all probability obtain it, and thereby be of help to the war effort. I have no objection to section 5 of this bill that we have under consideration, but in that section it is left to the discretion of the local board to order a man to the induction center. My amendment does not in any way affect the rights of the local board under this bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman is entirely in error about the statement that they are not entitled to an examination, because in section 5, the language is—

when it appears that his induction will shortly occur, shall, upon request, be ordered by his local board in accordance with schedules authorized by the Secretary of War, and Director of Selective Service, etc., to any regularly established induction station for a preinduction physical examination.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the distinguished chairman of the committee will read section 5 again, it says—

when it appears that his induction will shortly occur.

I do not want that man to have to wait until his induction will shortly occur, but I want him to be able to ascertain his status in advance, so that he can be working to help the war effort in some defense plant, and not leave his prephysical examination to the local board shortly before his time for induction. I know that the War Department will in all probability say that this may cause a hardship upon the medical examining staff at the induction centers. Six or eight months ago I might have agreed with them. But at the present time, with the possibility of the number of men being drafted into the service slackening off from now on, I do not think it will be a hardship, and, after all, the dividends that will be received from these men being able to get this prephysical examination far outweighs the hardships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The Director of Selective Service shall obtain necessary information pertaining to requests for deferments, deferments, exemptions, rejections, and replacement schedules of registrants from the various departments, agencies, and branches of the Government and shall report to the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs such information and the manner in which the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended, are being administered and the results thereof.

Such information shall be obtained by the Director of Selective Service through his chief liaison and legislative officer or such other liaison officer or officers as he may designate, and he shall make a report of such information monthly or at such other intervals as such committees may designate from time to time.

SEC. 7. Except as provided in this act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this act shall be in force.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLMER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill S. 763, and pursuant to House Resolution 330 reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the United States News which refers to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances and to include therewith some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by President Quezon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. On the vote just now taken the Speaker declared the bill was passed without opposition. I voted "No" as loud as I could and I want it to be known.

The SPEAKER. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon. The Chair announced that the bill was passed and without objection a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Well, it seems I can neither hear nor talk.

## COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what his committee is considering?

Mr. MAY. We are considering the bill which proposes to authorize the termination of war contracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hartford Courant of October 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein a speech delivered by me to the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O., on Sunday, October

24, 1943, at McKeesport, Pa., on subsidies and roll-backs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement by the Arkansas Policy Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address my own remarks and include certain data on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes this afternoon after the completion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a series of newspaper articles recently published dealing with the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address and other remarks made during naturalization proceedings in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's table and special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my own remarks and include a statement by Hon. Prentiss Brown, also a statement by President Roosevelt, and other statements.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PRICE CONTROL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many people do not realize what has been saved by reason of the Price Administration. I know many people who have been irritated and annoyed by rules and regulations because of price and rationing requirements; notwithstanding that we would have already suffered from ruinous inflation and a dollar would not be worth 10 cents had we not had an Office of Price Administration and a price control as good as we have. May I invite your attention to just one item, steel? During the last war the price of sheet steel was \$180 a ton; during this war it is \$42 a ton, and it has not increased one penny in 3 years' time. The difference in cost to the American people and the war effort if we had to pay as much for steel now as we paid then would be \$5,000,000,000 a year—just on that one item, steel. That is an enormous sum; in other words, instead of trying to raise \$10,000,000,000 more taxes if the price of steel had not been held down we would be trying to raise \$5,000,000,000 more just to take care of steel alone, and that is just one item out of many hundreds of thousands of different items that go into the cost of the war. It is true it is a major item.

Let us take copper. During the last war copper went to 37 cents a pound. During this war it has remained at 12 cents per pound and the reason is because we have had price control and subsidies. When new copper production was needed there were two ways of securing it: One was to encourage new production by increasing the price; the other was to give a higher price to new copper production only, the high-cost mines. The latter method is the one that was used, and by reason of using less than \$80,000,000 in subsidies on copper, lead, and zinc, the American taxpayer will save over a billion dollars—over a billion dollars a year. Yet you say that subsidies will cost the taxpayers a lot of money.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I will yield on that point.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman would give the House the figures on the price paid for these strategic war materials we have bought from foreign countries. I think he has those figures.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have those figures, but the gentleman would be rendering a distinct service if he himself would obtain them, which he could by merely requesting them, and placing them in the RECORD. I hope when he gets these figures he will compare them with the prices paid during the last war.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Texas is attempting to show—and rightly



so—the savings we have made in the purchase of these metals, but I think it would be fair while he is doing it also to show what we have paid not only to domestic producers of the metals he mentioned but also to the foreign producers.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman wishes to explore that, it is a matter for him to decide himself. No one disputes the statement I am making. Had the gentleman said I was not representing it correctly or that the price of certain metals was out of line—and I do not believe the gentleman did, either—I would be very glad to let him interrupt. Since there is no question about what I say, no one disputes it because I say they cannot dispute it, I see no reason why I should go out on a fishing expedition—and I say that respectfully to the gentleman—to explore something that the gentleman himself is interested in.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly the gentleman is also interested in the amount we are paying the foreign producers?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can get the information. He can take his telephone, call the R. F. C., and get the information in about 2 hours' time.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate all that.

Mr. PATMAN. I wish the gentleman would get it; and if there is anything wrong about this, I wish he would show it up.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate the information the gentleman is giving the House, but while he is at it I still insist that the gentleman should show all of the figures.

Mr. PATMAN. What would be the object of showing them? Why should I do it? What would they show?

Mr. JENSEN. It would give full information instead of partial information.

Mr. PATMAN. There are 1,800,000 different commodities and products. I cannot go into all of them. If the gentleman wants to go into any particular ones, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman distinguish between a subsidy to increase production and a subsidy to lower prices?

Mr. PATMAN. The subsidy for production is on copper and those products, and on farm products I cannot understand why they want to make the farmer the goat in this thing. They are perfectly willing to give subsidies on oil, copper, zinc, lead, in fact on everything they are perfectly willing to do that, but they do not want to do anything for agriculture. Why do they always want to single out the farmer and say that he shall be the goat?

We have been talking about the President not carrying out the will of Congress. In this case we passed a law, the date of it is October 2, 1942, in which we stated that the President is not only authorized but we wrote in it the language, and one of the gentleman's colleagues on that side was responsible for the language, that the President is authorized and directed to stabilize the cost of living and prices, wages, and salaries, as of

September 15, 1942, insofar as practicable. That was a mandate we gave the President. If the President carries out that mandate and he holds the line, there is only one man can suffer in the agricultural set-up and that is the farmer because it will be rolled right back on him. The only way you can protect the farmer is through subsidies. So why make the farmer the goat in all this? We say everybody else is entitled to a subsidy but the farmer is not entitled to it.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Is it not a fact that the farmers' organizations appeared before our committee and protested against the payment of subsidies?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not willing to accept that as a statement for all the farmers in the country. I know that anybody opposing subsidies under present conditions is speaking against the interests of the American farmer. He is not speaking for them. I am thoroughly convinced of that.

Mr. ROLPH. We had the representatives of the national farm organizations before our committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not desire to comment upon that, I may say to the gentleman from California. I say it is against the interests of the American farmer to be against subsidies. You never hear of these other people opposing them in the other commodities and in the other production. It is only the farmers and they want to prohibit the farmer from receiving these subsidies in order to make up his extra cost of production. The farmer's labor has increased in price, many items of expense have increased in expense, and if he is forced to sell at a price that will enable the consumer to get the goods on the basis of prices as of September 14, 1942, the farmer has got to have more money. Now, what difference does it make to the farmer whether the Government pays a part of the money and the man who buys it pays the other part, or whether the man who buys it from him pays all of it? It does not make any difference to the farmer and it certainly should not, especially when he is trying to help hold down inflation which will help the farmer the same as everybody else.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has very pointedly called attention to the direction of the Congress that the President is required to keep the price level around that of September 15, 1942; yet every Member of Congress knows it is impossible for the President to do so unless subsidies are used in some form; therefore, it necessarily follows that the honorable thing for the Congress to do is to repeal that provision of the law, instead of directing the President to do something as of September 15, 1942, which cannot be done unless we vote subsidies; is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that is, No Member of Congress would dare do it.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a situation that I cannot understand. Ordinarily, you would think that the labor organizations would be right in here fighting for subsidies, but you do not hear much about them. I hope that the reports are not true that they are going to stand by in the hope that these prices will be increased which will give them an unanswerable argument for wage and salary increases. I hope that is not true, but the reports are out and you hear them around here that that is the policy they expect to pursue. If that be true they will be following a very short-sighted policy. It is better to receive in wages and salaries what they now receive and receive less than they think they are justly entitled to receive because the dollars that they receive now will be worth dollars and will buy something substantial, instead of receiving a lot more of such dollars that will not buy much. So it is better to get good dollars even though you do not get as many of them than to get a lot more dollars that are worth a lot less.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. What justification would the unions have at this time for asking that their food be cheaper when it is a fact that there never was a time in the history of this Nation that less of the union man's dollar goes for food than at this minute?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say they are demanding that food be cheaper, but that it not be increased.

The gentleman brought up a very interesting question that people are making more money now than they have ever made in the past. That is very true of a lot of people. We will say about half of the people of the country have gotten the benefit of this, so why increase them, but please do not overlook the millions and millions of people who have had no price increase so far as salaries and wages are concerned. Do not overlook the fourteen and a half million people, heads of families, sometimes four in the family, who are receiving fixed incomes from retirement benefits, such as railroad retirement, social security, servicemen's benefits, and old-age assistance, and things like that.

If the gentleman wants the price of living to go up, their dollars will buy less. There are about half of the people of this country who are not receiving the benefits from these high wages and high salaries, so when the gentleman advocates higher living costs he advocates that they receive fewer cents for every dollar they are receiving. I hope the gentleman does not want to do that.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman say that he favors passing on part of our board bill to our returning soldiers and children yet unborn, at a time when we can afford to pay our full board bill?



Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. That is a very appealing phrase about paying the board bill. Oftentimes a phrase can be used that will require an hour's logic and reason to answer, but in this particular case it will not require hours of logic and reason to answer. This is not paying anybody's board bill. It is preventing inflation, our No. 2 problem. Our No. 1 problem is winning this war, but inflation is just as dangerous to the security of the country, almost, as the loss of the war. It is possible for us to lose as much in property value and money value through inflation as we would lose if we were to lose the war. So our No. 2 problem here at home is preventing inflation.

The gentleman brings up this argument about the board bill. If we can pay a subsidy of a cent a pound on 2 pounds of sugar out of 10 and save the consumer 8 more cents because four-fifths of the sugar is imported and only one-fifth is produced here, that looks to me like pretty good business judgment for the taxpayers, when all the people are taxpayers now. People who use tobacco or gasoline or ride on public transportation, who go to picture shows or theaters—you can hardly buy anything these days or enjoy anything that you do not pay a tax to the Federal Government. If the people can permit a dollar of their money to be used on subsidies and save them up to \$30, why is it not just good business sense?

Further, the gentleman's side is always arguing this paying the board bill, but I notice the gentleman's side does not oppose paying a subsidy for fuel oil. Is the gentleman against paying subsidies on fuel-oil transportation?

Mr. JENSEN. I have never taken a position on it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has not taken a position; all right. The members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that is bringing out this bill, are not opposed to paying that, so you are not opposed to helping pay the fuel bill. It is all right to pass that on to the returning servicemen.

Further, public housing has been supported by the gentleman, doubtless. Public housing is nothing more than paying a part of somebody's rent. So it is all right to pay out of the Public Treasury a part of the fuel bill and it is all right to pay out of the Public Treasury part of the rent, but it is just simply awful to use one dollar out of the Treasury to save the people \$30. I cannot follow that logic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is talking about stopping inflation. If we take

\$1,000,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury and pay subsidies which will make prices less, there will be more dollars in the pockets of the American people. Is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would not expect me to answer that in 2 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. It should not take long to answer that question.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not demonstrate as much knowledge on that question as I should like him to. I hope he studies it.

Mr. JENSEN. I would not insult the gentleman. I have demonstrated enough judgment on it so that the gentleman cannot answer my questions.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman believes that. I am glad he has some consolation.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter written by Mr. Prentiss Brown when he resigned as Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and also the President's reply. I am inserting these letters in the RECORD in the hope that the Members will read them. Mr. Brown points out how much has been done through the Office of Price Administration. He gives prices compared with prices during the First World War. He shows the things that have been done through the Price Administration. The President mentions something down here that I hope all of you notice. In his reply to Mr. Brown he says:

It was inevitable that a few men would be so anxious to increase their income that they would resent the Government's preventing them from increasing prices. I believe with you, however, that the vast majority of the people realize that under war conditions price restrictions are necessary, and even though their profits are less, they recall the far greater sacrifices made by our boys in the armed services and loyally support the organization.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Does the gentleman endorse the proposed increase in the price of fuel oil of 35 cents per gallon?

Mr. PATMAN. I am for the proposed increase in the price of crude oil. We must encourage production of crude oil. It is very necessary in the war effort, anyway, to encourage production of crude oil, and I am for it.

The inconsistent thing about this matter is this, and I want you to think about it. The Members on the gentleman's side are fine, honorable, upright men. The gentleman from California is one of them.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. He says he is against subsidies.

Mr. ROLPH. I am against a blank check.

ALL RIGHT TO PAY A SUBSIDY ON OLEOMARGARINE BUT NOT ON BUTTER

Mr. PATMAN. This section that the gentleman helped write is against sup-

port prices. It prevents the Food Administration from announcing support prices, which are very vital and highly necessary, and then winds up by saying, "Although we are against subsidies, we hate them, they are wrong, however, this shall not apply to vegetable oils and fats and oil seeds." That opens up a big field there where you say subsidies are good. How can you justify that? How can you justify paying support prices on oleomargarine and not on butter?

Mr. ROLPH. We are in favor of support prices to increase production and aid the war effort.

Mr. PATMAN. Not under section 3. We stop it. Under section 3, on December 31 there will be no more support prices except in the cases the gentleman mentioned there as an exception, where they are all right on peanuts and cottonseed and soybeans and things like that. What I cannot understand is how the gentleman can be so hard against subsidies and why they are so bad, and yet he is willing to exempt so much in subsidies.

Mr. ROLPH. The amount I am willing to accept, as the gentleman well knows, is a very small amount comparatively.

Mr. PATMAN. Sixty million dollars per year and more—that one thing—and you know that runs into a lot of money, even in California.

Mr. ROLPH. But it is vastly different from billions of dollars.

Mr. PATMAN. Besides, the gentleman is not against the transportation or the fuel-oil subsidy, nor is he against the rent bill or the copper or the lead or zinc subsidy or any other subsidy except so far as the farmers are concerned.

Mr. ROLPH. I voted for all of those in the price-control bill, as the gentleman did.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Mr. Brown's resignation as Price Administrator, and President Roosevelt's letter accepting it, as printed in the New York Times:

#### MR. BROWN'S LETTER

OCTOBER 19, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit my resignation as Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

On September 22 last, I advised Justice Byrnes of my desire to leave and understand he told you of it. The policy of price control is now well defined in the law and in your orders. The main task from now on is administrative. I would not leave if I thought the Office would suffer. We have greatly improved our organization and I believe it is in competent hands.

We in price control face a difficult task in public relations. We are the expendables in the war on the domestic front. Many of the accomplishments of the present, particularly the change from an upward trend in living costs to a downward trend, are due in part to the efforts of executives who have left. The men now in our chief executive positions are experts in administration, and that is our prime task.

Thank you for the expression of your desire that I remain. When I took office it was my hope to leave when the appropriation bill for the remaining life of the agency was passed. I could not then do so because I had not yet



found the men who would carry on. Now we have them.

Price control is not only successful but is appreciated by the country. Below I give a few outstanding examples of our accomplishments. The country, contrary to what one might think from what he hears in Washington, is for price control and rationing as administered. Recent public surveys show it.

#### CORDIAL ATTITUDE CITED

I have made speeches in New York, Milwaukee, Omaha, Boston, and Chicago. I found the most cordial attitude and the newspaper and other public comment was excellent. The same general approval was expressed by numberless callers. The drive against O. P. A. before House committees last spring was intense.

It undoubtedly injured the agency in the congressional mind, but the recess and visits home improved the attitude toward us. I have had many expressions from Members of the Senate and House that are most encouraging.

A few outstanding facts are these: The upward trend in the cost of living has been definitely arrested. Taking the September 15, 1942, level as a basis, by May 1943, there was a 6.2-percent rise. Soon after the effect of dollars-and-cents prices, control of fresh vegetables, generally better enforcement, and the effect of your April 8 order began to be felt. June showed a reduction to 5.9 percent; August to 4.6 percent.

It is interesting to note the comparison of the wholesale prices of 1 year ago and those of today as contained in the New York Times commodity price index. The October 17 issue shows that the increases are mainly in those items, such as wheat, corn, oats, and barley, where either we did not have authority to act by reason of the parity limitation or the commodity had only recently reached parity.

#### GIVES EXAMPLES ON PRICES

A few outstanding examples of the solidity of price control are as follows:

| Item                          | Price         |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                               | Oct. 16, 1943 | Oct. 17, 1942 |
| Wheat.....bushel..            | \$1.94½       | \$1.47½       |
| Corn.....do.....              | 1.21½         | .95½          |
| Coffee.....pound..            | .09½          | .09½          |
| Sugar.....do.....             | .0560         | .0560         |
| Creamery butter.....do..      | .42½          | .46½          |
| Lard.....do.....              | .1392½        | .1392½        |
| Iron.....ton.....             | 25.84         | 25.84         |
| Steel.....do.....             | 34.00         | 34.00         |
| Copper.....pound..            | .12           | .12           |
| Cotton print cloth.....yard.. | .08971        | .08971        |
| Hides.....pound..             | .15½          | .15½          |
| Gas (tank wagon).....gallon.. | .1060         | .1060         |
| Crude oil.....barrel..        | 1.11          | 1.11          |

The great bulk of commodities are the same. The principal difficulty, as you know, has been with fresh vegetables and fresh fruits which we are getting under control.

The price level and relationship of 1926 is generally looked upon as a reasonable base. The September 15, 1942, level was almost exactly at the 1926 level, being 99.4 percent of it. Last spring this index rose to 103 plus. It has been reduced to 102 plus percent and the trend is still downward.

#### BASIS FOR COMPARISON

To me the best basis for comparison has always been the percentage of price increase in the First World War against the percentage of increase in the Second World War. We use August of 1914 and September of 1939 as the bases because those are the dates in which the wars in Europe began, and the pressures on our prices commenced. The latest avail-

able figures are those after 49 months of war. I give below the percentage of increase:

| Item  | August 1914-18<br>World War No. 1<br>(percent price increase) | September 1939-43<br>World War No. 2<br>(percent price increase) |
|---|---|--|
| Cost of living, total <sup>1</sup> .....            | 50.3  | 24.9   |
| Food.....   | 63.9  | 46.7   |
| Clothing.....                                       | 85.3  | 28.5   |
| House furnishings.....                              | 77.2  | 24.8   |
| Wholesale prices, total.....                        | 96.1  | 37.5   |
| Raw materials.....                                  | 102.1   | 69.5   |
| Semi-manufactures.....                              | 131.3   | 24.7   |
| Furnished products.....                             | 87.6  | 26.0   |
| Industrial commodities <sup>4</sup> .....           | 92.4  | 21.2   |
| SELECTED MANUFACTURED ITEMS                         |   |  |
| Steel plates (tank).....                            | 187.4   | 0  |
| Plate glass.....                                    | 76.1  | 0  |
| Wool blankets.....                                  | 164.7   | 50.0   |
| Cotton hosiery (men's).....                         | 132.3   | 71.9   |
| Blue denims.....                                    | 214.8   | 74.5   |
| Prices received by farmers for all commodities..... | 91  | 119  |
| Prices received by farmers for 58 foods.....        | 78  | 116  |
| Prices paid by farmers for commodities.....         | 71  | 84   |

<sup>1</sup> July 1914 to July 1918.

<sup>2</sup> August 1939 to August 1943.

<sup>3</sup> Rent and fuel, not available by months.

<sup>4</sup> All commodities other than farm products and foods.

<sup>5</sup> To May 1943, the latest available.

<sup>6</sup> 1914 to 1918, not available monthly for World War No. 1 period.

#### PRAISES THE ADMINISTRATION

On the basis of our entrance into the war, prices increased 29½ percent in the first 19 months of the First World War, while prices have increased by 12 percent in the first 19 months of this war.

A couple of important commodity-price comparisons might be of interest. Copper sold for 37 cents a pound during the First World War and sells for 12 cents now. Steel plate sold for \$180 a ton in the First World War. It sells now for \$42 a ton.

It is my deliberate judgment that as a result of my messages to Congress and the passage by Congress of the Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and the subsequent Executive orders of October and April, in the most complicated and intricate task of price control in the world (because our problems are greater than those of any other nation) in a period of tremendous increase in our national income, your administration has succeeded to a remarkable degree in alleviating the evils of rising prices and consequent inflation.

It was perfectly obvious that bitter complaint would be made, some of it justified, because no administration could hope to delve into the intricacies of the business structure without causing dislocations, distress, and dissatisfaction.

#### REPORTS MANY HARDSHIPS

I know that many real hardships have occurred. Regulation has been hard for our businessmen to take. It is getting easier. Individual casualties are most unfortunate, and in many lines of effort they have occurred all too frequently; but the over-all picture is what the Nation views.

The net income of the farmer is 90 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. The average weekly wage of the American laborer is 33 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. Corporation profits, after taxes, are 15 percent higher than those earned in 1941, while prices are but 12 percent greater than they were on December 7, 1941, when the Senate took up the subject of price control, resulting in the act of January 30, 1942.

Business mortality is at the lowest figure on record.

Price control does not claim credit, but these results were achieved during the period of price control. Controls certainly did not prevent material gains for farmer, laborer, the businessman. During that time the Government of the United States and the citizens of the United States have saved tremendous sums of money over what would have been the cost to them if prices had followed the pattern of increases during the First World War.

#### FAST SAVINGS REPORTED

It is estimated by the research division of this agency that the Government will have saved over \$67,000,000,000 by the end of 1943 and the saving to consumer and the general public is given as \$22,000,000,000, a total of over \$89,000,000,000.

These things have been done with a substantial reduction in the number of employees in the central office at Washington, D. C., the drop being from 4,800 last January to 4,200 at the present time. The rationing program has required larger employment in the offices outside of the Capital, the rise being from 39,000 to 49,000 in the field. We not only stayed within the congressional limitation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, but we were able to get along without an additional \$23,000,000 that was provided, and we rather stand out as the agency which turned back money to the Government.

While I think the Congress cut us too much for the current fiscal year and eliminated some necessary expenditures, I take comfort in the fact that two appropriation committees, to whom we were able to present our requests in person in hearings, gave us substantially what we asked and that the reduction was made on the floor of the House of Representatives by those not as well informed as were the committee members. However, we have cut our cloth to the pattern.

#### DRAFT DEFERMENTS DENIED

Speaking of personnel, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that recently in the House of Representatives on the drafting-of-fathers issue it was implied on the floor by the gentleman who represents the Twenty-sixth District of New York that a sizable addition to the Army might be raised from those unfairly deferred in the Federal service, particularly in the Office of Price Administration.

I was somewhat surprised at this, as I had issued an order shortly after coming into office last January preventing the employment of any physically fit persons within the draft age, and directed that deferment should be requested only in the most extreme cases. I said, "There is no irreplaceable man in O. P. A."

I checked and found that out of 4,206 employees in Washington, only 5 within the draft age are now deferred, and that out of approximately 49,000 in the field there are only 2 of draft age deferred—7 out of 53,000. These 53,000 employees are only a part of the great organization we have built. There are 131,000 volunteers in our organization, making a grand total of 184,000 who are helping in this great task. They are a loyal and valiant army, and against rather heavy opposition are winning the battle for sharing what we have at a fair price.

This is the status of price control as I leave it.

#### SUPPORTS SUBSIDY PROGRAM

As I view the immediate future of the inflation struggle, I see two major problems for the administration:

1. The subsidy question. Without a subsidy plan the price structure cannot be held,



and wages will be forced upward. No thinking person can deny that the increase in prices and wages if we reject subsidies will greatly outrun the cost to the Government of the subsidies.

If it were merely a question of the subsidy money against the increase in price, it would be of little consequence. The danger lies in the impetus higher prices give to the wage demand. Without subsidies butter would sell at 60 instead of 50 cents. Add to that the increase in the price of meat, milk, and other commodities that would follow the rejection of subsidies, and you encourage, even justify, higher wages. It is this momentum to the wage demand, the inevitable twirl to the inflation spiral with its devastating result, that should cause the Congress to continue the program and reject crippling amendments to the Commodity Credit and R. F. C. legislation.

2. The matter of renewal of price control after July 1, 1944, when the law expires by limitation. The greatest danger is in the post-war period. There must be controls after June of 1944. I would advise a year's renewal with subsequent consideration by the Congress as to further renewals.

On these two problems, if as a private citizen I can aid by presenting my views to the appropriate committees, I will be happy to do so.

In closing I express to you and through you to Justice Byrnes my appreciation of the unfailing support given in our effort to carry into effect the intent of the acts of Congress and the Executive orders.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,  
Administrator.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

DEAR PRENTISS: When Justice Byrnes told me of your desire to resign I asked him to urge you to reconsider. I did so because I knew you had possibly the most difficult task in the service of the Government and you were doing a grand job.

However, I recall that when I asked you to accept the appointment you advised me how you had neglected your private affairs while you were serving in the Senate and of your desire to return to Michigan at the earliest possible date. But you generously yielded to my request to take charge of O. P. A. temporarily until you could find someone to take over the task. When you tell me now that you have found men capable of carrying on and feel it your duty to leave, I cannot insist upon your remaining and with reluctance I must accept your resignation.

The story of the Office of Price Administration recited by you in your letter is a story of which you may justly be proud. I get great comfort from the opinion you express that the people of the country appreciate the accomplishments of the organization. The administration of the law required interference with the business and with the lives of the people. It is an interference justified only by the necessities of war.

It was inevitable that a few men would be so anxious to increase their income that they would resent the Government's preventing them from increasing prices. I believe with you, however, that the vast majority of the people realize that under war conditions price restrictions are necessary, and even though their profits are less, they recall the far greater sacrifices made by our boys in the armed services and loyally support the organization.

You have performed a difficult task with intelligence and, above all, with courage, and you have my sincere appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

#### THE O. P. A.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss the O. P. A. I am glad that the previous speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has inserted a recent letter from President Roosevelt to Director Brown and a letter from Director Brown to the President. We all admire the study made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the activities of the O. P. A. At this time I am especially interested in the operation of the O. P. A. in my city. What I shall say today to the House I say not in the spirit of criticism, but as a matter of information. In New York we are going through the unhappy days of change in directors, assistant directors, and employees. They have been resigning in large numbers for reasons beyond my knowledge, and for reasons not disclosed in their formal letters of resignation. We have had several national directors in a short space of time. In New York with millions of people vitally affected by every change, and deeply concerned, we find it difficult to explain these many changes. There is an apparent break-down in the organization of the O. P. A. The newspapers have taken occasion to editorialize, and most of them have been sharply critical, and some grossly unfair.

I am not prepared to suggest a remedy, but I want the RECORD to show that we in New York are concerned and we hope that the new director will make it his business at the first opportunity to study our local problem. Unless he does, and unless there are some radical changes in the organization, I fear that there may be a break-down of enforcement. The people working in the office are earnest and sincere, but when the directors and the head men quit overnight, leaving large staffs of people without adequate direction or control, you cannot expect good administration. Whether or not our problem is an internal conflict that cannot be reconciled, I am unprepared to say. But I do know something is lacking. The organization may be short of help or proper space but, whatever the cause, I hope that it will be given prompt, close, and serious attention, if necessary by the President himself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschlag;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 27, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a hearing Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10:00 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10:00 a. m., on Tuesday, November



2, 1943, in room 346 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 27, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and H. R. 2832.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

881. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the true facts concerning the draft deferment of Government employees (H. Doc. No. 343), was taken from the Speaker's table; referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3541. A bill to grant veterans of the present war base pay and family allowances or allowances for quarters for 1 year after their separation from the service or release from active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3542 (by request). A bill to amend title 1 of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations, to provide for rehabilitation of certain disabled veterans who served between September 16, 1940, and December 7, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3543. A bill to provide compensation upon discharge for physical disability of enlisted personnel of the naval service in cases where disability is service-connected but not the result of own misconduct; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 3544. A bill relating to the terms of the District Courts of the United States for the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3545. A bill to amend sections 2720 (a) and 3260 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the transfer tax, and the tax on manufacturers and dealers, in the case of

certain small-game guns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 3546. A bill to create an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to prohibit the use of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting by Government departments and agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 334. Resolution creating a Select Committee to investigate the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. Res. 335. Resolution creating a Select Committee of the House of Representatives to conduct investigations concerning the accuracy, value, integrity, and dependability of all statistical, fact-finding, and planning agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 3547. A bill for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3548. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Nelson and W. E. Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Rely; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Strang; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3551. A bill for the relief of Joe Kaplan; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3227. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Roland Boehm and 80 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3228. Also, petition of Edw. Bircher and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3229. Also, petition of Mike Hummel and 360 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3230. Also, petition of W. Zals and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3231. Also, petition of Charlotte Mueller and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3232. Also, petition of William Renisch and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3233. Also, petition of William Boneman and 40 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3234. Also, petition of Herman A. Wochele and 46 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3235. Also, petition of Miss F. Mahlik and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3236. Also, petition of John E. Koehler and 286 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3237. Also, petition of Hodges, Inc., of Washington, D. C., and signed by 60 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3238. Also, petition of Benson J. Woods, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3239. Also, petition of F. A. Callan, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3240. Also, petition of M. F. Parker, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3241. Also, petition of E. A. Rickenbacher, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3242. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of J. E. Mitchell, of Olympia, Wash., and 89 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3243. Also, petition of Mark Johnson of Hoquiam, Wash., and 26 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3244. Also, petition of L. C. Galyan, secretary, Building and Construction Trades Council of Bremerton and vicinity, and members of this council, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3245. Also, petition of the King County, Wash., Pomona Grange, urging passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in, into, and the exportation from the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3246. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, No. 290, of Waterloo, Iowa, opposing House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3247. Also, petition of the Washington Park and Golf Club, Cedar Falls, Iowa, and signed by many residents of Black Hawk County, opposing House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



3248. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of T. A. Rawlings, Gardner Chacksfield, Riner G. Saeger, C. J. Doll, Clyde W. Risch, John Asher, John C. Akin, Harry Overberg, Raymond J. Kern, Thomas Parker, Elmer C. Luchtendahl, Henry G. Stumpe, Carey A. Fleming, Robert Oaks, Charles Merk, George Flesch, Harry Manz, Joseph L. Kempf, Herman Fox, H. L. Gustin, H. J. Determan, George J. Kopp, Frank Haunsz, Robert W. Stone, W. C. Apfel, Harvey Tibbatts, Earl E. Baker, Albert J. Zeiser, Robert J. Fries, Frank Sholler, Edmund A. Moorman, Joseph Weber, Robert H. Kennedy, John J. Beckstedt, Peter N. Driscoll, Herbert W. Schwartz, and 641 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3249. By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of Kenneth Harris, of New Dorp, Staten Island, N. Y., and 87 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3250. By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Springfield, Ill., and signed by Robert B. Irwin, secretary-manager, by order of the board of directors, with reference to bills and resolutions pending before the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States pertaining to the subject of freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3251. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Clay County Medical Association, Clay City, Ill., opposing Senate bill 1161 and House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3252. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petitions sent by Mary Scott Russell, president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Georgia, and signed by numerous other citizens of Georgia, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3253. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. Gwilym Davis and 79 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3254. Also, petition of Sarah E. Ellsworth and 53 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3255. Also, petition of Rev. Samuel McDowell and 59 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3256. Also, petition of Mrs. S. H. Lewis and 44 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou mighty Sovereign of the sea, with each thought a prayer we come this day glimpsing seas wider and vaster than ever the Psalmist knew, as we take upon our lips his words of old: "There go the ships." There go the ships of our Nation's righteous cause; there go the ships whose thunder makes tyranny tremble, whose wealthy cargo is humanity's fears and its hopes of future years. Today we think of that expanding armada with pride and gratitude for the sweat and toil of the workmen who launched them, for the valiant crusaders who tread their decks, for the trained and tried officers who command them, and for the chaplains who minister in the things that matter most. Upon them all may there rest the benediction of Thy mercy which is like the wideness of the sea.

As on all the seas of the globe, in perils from above and beneath, far-called, our navies sail away, God of our fathers, Thou knowest that every ship carries our faith, our hopes, our prayers, our pledge to be worthy of them until the peace is won for which they must suffer and for which we toil and pray. May our soldiers of the sea incline their hearts to keep Thy law and to be true to the sacred worship hour which hallows each ship when the pennant of our holy faith flies majestically above the Nation's flag yet so close that they merge into one banner of victory, dedicated to the service of God and the brotherhood of man. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 26, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; and

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|              |                 |               |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Alken        | George          | Overton       |
| Andrews      | Gerry           | Pepper        |
| Austin       | Gillette        | Radcliffe     |
| Bailey       | Green           | Reed          |
| Ball         | Guffey          | Revercomb     |
| Bankhead     | Hatch           | Reynolds      |
| Bilbo        | Hawkes          | Robertson     |
| Brewster     | Hayden          | Russell       |
| Bridges      | Hill            | Scruggam      |
| Brooks       | Holman          | Shipstead     |
| Buck         | Johnson, Calif. | Smith         |
| Burton       | Johnson, Colo.  | Stewart       |
| Bushfield    | Kilgore         | Taft          |
| Butler       | Langer          | Thomas, Idaho |
| Byrd         | Lodge           | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper       | Lucas           | Thomas, Utah  |
| Caraway      | McClellan       | Truman        |
| Chavez       | McFarland       | Tunnell       |
| Clark, Idaho | McKellar        | Vandenberg    |
| Clark, Mo.   | McNary          | Van Nuys      |
| Connally     | Maybank         | Wagner        |
| Danaher      | Mead            | Walsh         |
| Davis        | Millikin        | Wheeler       |
| Downey       | Murdock         | Wherry        |
| Eastland     | Murray          | White         |
| Ellender     | Nye             | Wiley         |
| Ferguson     | O'Daniel        | Wilson        |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on public matters.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### POST-WAR EDUCATION FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

### To the Congress of the United States:

On November 13, 1942, on signing the bill calling for the induction by selective service of young men 18 and 19 years old, I appointed a committee of educators, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, to study the problem of education of our service men and women after the war. The objective was to enable those young people whose education had been interrupted to resume their schooling and to provide an oppor-